Foreign
Broadcast
Information
Service

ANNIVERSARY
1941 – 1991

Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-91-211
Thursday
31 October 1991

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-91-211 CONTENTS *31 October 1991*

NOTICE TO READERS: An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

NOTICE TO READERS: The United States Government recognizes the independence of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Worldwide Issues

Reportage Continues on Gorbachev Madrid Visit 1
    Bush, Gorbachev Meeting Previewed *[IZVESTIYA 30 Oct]* 1
    Bush, Gorbachev Talks Assessed *[IZVESTIYA 31 Oct]* 1
    More on 30 Oct News Conference *[Radio Rossii]* 3
    Bush Speaks at Peace Conference *[TASS]* 4
    PRAVDA Sees 'Success' at Talks *[31 Oct]* 4
    PRAVDA Views Peace Efforts *[30 Oct]* 5
    Gorbachev, Spain's Gonzalez Meet *[TASS]* 6
    Gorbachev-Gonzalez News Conference *[TASS]* 6
    Gorbachev, Rome Club Chairman Meet *[TASS]* 9
    Gorbachev Seeks To Assert Status *[IZVESTIYA 31 Oct]* 9
    Commentary on Possible Peace *[Moscow International]* 10
    Pogodin Commentary on Conference *[Moscow International]* 11
    PRAVDA on Peace Plan Agenda *[30 Oct]* 11
    Moscow Forum Views 'Architecture' *[IZVESTIYA 28 Oct]* 12
    USSR's Madrid Role Affirmed *[PRAVDA 30 Oct]* 13
PLO Envoy Comments on Peace Conference *[INTERFAX]* 14
Egyptian Envoy Views Peace Prospects *[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 29 Oct]* 15
Memorandum Signed With G-7 on Foreign Debt *[INTERFAX]* 16
    Joint Responsibility Confirmed *[IZVESTIYA 30 Oct]* 17
    Unprofessional Behavior Noted *[INTERFAX]* 17
    'Disorder', 'Vacillation' Reported *[IZVESTIYA 29 Oct]* 17

United States & Canada

KGB Official Admits Past Ties With Clergy *[INTERFAX]* 18
Further on U.S. Defense Official's Visit *[TASS]* 18
    Meets Lobov, Views Military Conversion *[TASS]* 19

Northeast Asia

Foreign Ministry Issues Memo on Kurils *[INTERFAX]* 19
ROK Paper Claims Weapons to DPRK Stopped *[Moscow Radio]* 20
ROK Military Attache Interviewed *[Moscow International]* 20
More IZVESTIYA Reportage on KAL Tragedy *[17 Oct]* 20

Near East & South Asia

Israeli Envoy on Palestinian Question *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 30 Oct]* 22
Petrovskiy on Afghan POW's, UN Meetings *[INTERFAX]* 24
Impact of Policy Shift on Afghanistan Noted *[IZVESTIYA 26 Oct]* 24

Sub-Saharan Africa

Liberian Patriotic Front Releases Fishermen *[INTERFAX]* 25
  Foreign Ministry on Release *[TASS]* 25

East Europe

Serbian Delegation 'Disappointed' With Visit *[TASS]* 25
Official Cables SFRY on Missing Journalists *[Moscow TV]* 26

West Europe

Gorbachev, Mitterrand Hold Talks in France 26
  Agenda for Talks Reported *[Moscow Radio]* 26
  Talks Begin *[TASS]* 26
  French TV Interviews Presidents *[TASS]* 26
  Gorbachev on Relations With Yeltsin *[TASS]* 26
  Importance of Visit Noted *[Moscow TV]* 27
  Gorbachev Departs for Moscow *[TASS]* 27
Barannikov Predicts 5 Million Emigrants *[Berlin ADN]* 27
Germans Intercept Tanks Destined for Israel *[IZVESTIYA 30 Oct]* 27
Ambassador to Sweden Departs Post *[IZVESTIYA 29 Oct]* 28

Latin America & Caribbean

Work on Cuban Nuclear Power Plant May Stop *[INTERFAX]* 28

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Political & Social

New Presidential Communication Center Set Up *[TASS]* 29
Committee for Operational Management Meets 29
  Apprehensions Dispelled *[TASS]* 29
  Call for Support of Entrepreneurship *[INTERFAX]* 29
Coup Investigation To Conclude in Nov *[INTERFAX]* 29
Analysis Shows Majority Sided With SCSE *[TASS]* 30
Parties Termed CPSU Rightful 'Heirs' 30
  Congresses on 26, 27 Oct *[IZVESTIYA 29 Oct]* 30
  Party Holds Founding Conference *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 29 Oct]* 31
Observer Looks at CPSU's 'Miserable Finale' *[NEW TIMES 8-14 Oct]* 33
Public Associations for Democracy Formed *[TASS]* 34
Bakatin on Reform of Intelligence Services *[TRUD 25 Oct]* 34
Economic Relations Ministry To Be Absorbed *[INTERFAX]* 35
Pankin Dismisses Russian Counterpart's 'Slip' *[IZVESTIYA 29 Oct]* 35
TASS Carries Press Review for 31 Oct 35

Economic

Statistics Indicate Economic Situation Worse *[Radio Rossii]* 36
Foreign Tourism Suffers Drastic Reductions *[INTERFAX]* 36

Agricultural

Statistics Indicate Famine Not 'Inevitable' *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 30 Oct]* 37

BALTIC COUNTRIES

Estonia

- Guided Missiles Stolen From Tallinn Garrison *[BALTFAX]* 39
- USSR Military Train Arrives Unannounced *[BALTFAX]* 39
- Shaposhnikov in Armenia, Meets Ter-Petrosyan *[TASS]* 39

Latvia

- Yeltsin, Gorbunovs Discuss Economic Ties *[BALTFAX]* 39
- Economic Relations With Russia Discussed 39
  - Accused of 'Economic Warfare' *[IZVESTIYA 30 Oct]* 39
  - Economic Blockade Viewed *[BALTFAX]* 40
  - Economic Talks 'Strained' *[BALTFAX]* 40
  - Shift to World Prices Assailed *[BALTFAX]* 40
- Interest in Purchasing Army Property Noted *[BALTFAX]* 40
  - Machine Guns, Pistols Bought *[Riga Radio]* 41
- Report on Interior Minister's Talks in Moscow *[Riga Radio]* 41
- Deputy Claims Military Property Being Removed *[Moscow Radio]* 41
- Ivans Says Single State Not Yet Feasible *[BALTFAX]* 41
- Opposition on Existence of Political Prisoners *[BALTFAX]* 41
- Polish Travel for Tourists, Businessmen Barred *[BALTFAX]* 42
- Republic Energy Situation Assessed *[BALTFAX]* 42

Lithuania

- Landsbergis on War Crime Suspects Issue *[Radio Vilnius]* 42
- Deputy Discusses Removal of KGB Documents *[BALTFAX]* 42
- Defense Minister Views Insuring Security *[Vilnius International]* 43
- Control of Ignalina Safety Equipment Sought *[EKHO LITVY 22 Oct]* 43
- Saudargas Meets Polish Counterpart in Warsaw *[Vilnius International]* 43
- Procurator Interrogates Communist Official *[BALTFAX]* 44

RSFSR

Supreme Soviet

- Filatov Invited To Run for Deputy Chairman *[INTERFAX]* 45
- Khasbulatov News Conference After Election 45
  - Comments on Various Issues *[Radio Rossii]* 45
  - Notes 'Monopoly on Power' *[Radio Rossii]* 45
- Resolution on Chechen-Ingush Elections Issued *[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 29 Oct]* 45

Fifth Congress of People's Deputies

- Congress of People's Deputies Proceedings *[Russian TV]* 46
- Yeltsin Appeal for More Power, Election Ban *[TASS]* 47
  - Further on Appeal, Aims *[TASS]* 47
- Khasbulatov To Resolve Interethnic Problems *[TASS]* 48
- Draft Amendments to Constitution Presented *[INTERFAX]* 48
  - More on Amendments *[TASS]* 48
  - Alternative Bill Submitted *[INTERFAX]* 48
- Yeltsin's Economic Reform Package Critiqued *[TASS]* 49
  - Further Reactions *[TASS]* 49
- Russian Constitutional Court Judges Sworn In *[TASS]* 50
- Liberal Democrat Zhirinoskiy Predicts 'Chaos' *[INTERFAX]* 50
- Rutskoy Says Party Activities 'Illegal' *[INTERFAX]* 50
- Official on Rumor To Suspend Activities *[INTERFAX]* 50

Federation Affairs

Yeltsin Meeting With Faction Heads Described *[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 22 Oct]* 51
Khasbulatov Interviewed on Current Issues *[Russian TV]* 52
Presidential Order on Defense Counselor Noted *[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 24 Oct]* 54
'Democratic Russia' Backs Yeltsin's Plans *[TASS]* 54
Russian Parties To Back Yeltsin Reforms *[Radio Rossii]* 54
Russian Trade Union Head Klochkov Interviewed *[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 26 Oct]* 55
Trade Union Leaders Warn of Confrontation *[INTERFAX]* 55
Burbulis Comments on 'Minefield of Power' *[IZVESTIYA 28 Oct]* 55
Fedorov Interviewed on Reform Views *[MOSCOW NEWS 20-27 Oct]* 60
Kuban Prohibits Export of Food Outside Russia *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 26 Oct]* 60
Export Restrictions in Rostov *[Moscow Radio]* 60
Labor Minister on 'Polish Shock Therapy' *[TASS]* 60
Yavlinskiy, Rutskoy on Prime Ministerial Post *[Moscow TV]* 61
Russian Customs Committee Established *[Radio Rossii]* 61
Government Appoints New Ministry Heads *[INTERFAX]* 61
President's Information Chief Reassigned *[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 26 Oct]* 61
President of New Citizens' Rights Group Named *[PRAVDA 28 Oct]* 62
Russian Revival Party Holds Founding Congress *[TASS]* 62
Isolation From Other Republics Viewed *[MOSCOW NEWS 20-27 Oct]* 62

WESTERN REPUBLICS

Moldova

Threat To Nationalize Union Enterprises Cited *[IZVESTIYA 30 Oct]* 64
'Heavy-Industry' Combines Taken Over *[Bucharest ROMPRES]* 64
President Snegur Criticizes Gorbachev *[INTERFAX]* 64
Ministry of National Security Established *[Moscow Radio]* 64
Presidential Election Campaign Called Normal *[INTERFAX]* 64
Minister Hopes To Attract Foreign Capital *[TASS]* 65
National Bank in Conflict With Dnestr Banks *[Moscow Radio]* 65

Ukraine

'Unauthorized' Missile Launch in Kirovograd *[Radio Rossii]* 65
Accidental Launch Confirmed *[TASS]* 65
Ministerial Talks With Russia Conclude *[INTERFAX]* 65
Environment Minister on Chernobyl Closure *[Kiev Radio]* 66
Decision on USSR Supreme Soviet Role Detailed *[IZVESTIYA 28 Oct]* 67
Supreme Soviet Investigates Coup Involvement *[Kiev Radio]* 67
Prime Minister Fokin Views G-7 Talks *[Kiev Radio]* 68
Rukh Vice President Comments on Independence *[Hamburg DIE WELT 30 Oct]* 68
Republic Economic Indicators Fall *[INTERFAX]* 69
Military Worries Over Sovereignty Expressed *[INTERFAX]* 69
U.S. Response to Arms Plans Noted *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 25 Oct]* 69
New Polish Envoy Presented to Journalists *[Moscow TV]* 69

CAUCASUS

Armenia

Defense Minister Shaposhnikov Visits *[TASS]* 70

Azerbaijan

Popular Front Presents Ultimatum to Government *[INTERFAX]* 70
Three Killed in NKAO Violence *[TASS]* 70
Incident on Azerbaijani-Turkish Border Noted *[Radio Rossii]* 70
Parliament Issues Appeal on Independence *[INTERFAX]* 70

Georgia

Republic Supreme Council Activities Described ... 71
    Fails To Open 30 Oct *[Moscow Radio]* ... 71
    Declines To Sign Economic Treaty 31 Oct *[TASS]* ... 71
Shaposhnikov Arrives in Tbilisi, Holds Talks *[Moscow International]* ... 71
Cabinet of Ministers Studies Economic Crisis *[INTERFAX]* ... 71
20 Wounded in South Ossetian Violence *[TASS]* ... 71
Opposition Claims 70 Political Prisoners Jailed *[INTERFAX]* ... 72

CENTRAL ASIA

Kazakhstan

Territorial Nuclear Weapons To Be Eliminated *[Moscow Radio]* ... 73
Ties With UK To Expand With Nazarbayev Visit *[Moscow TV]* ... 73

Kyrgyzstan

Migration Committee To Assist Citizens *[TASS]* ... 73

Tajikistan

Economic Agreement Signed With Kyrgyzstan *[TASS]* ... 73
Federation of Trade Unions Threaten Strike *[TASS]* ... 73

Turkmenistan

Niyazov on Treaty Signing, Administrative Reform *[IZVESTIYA 29 Oct]* ... 74
Republic Grain Prices 'Drastically' Increased *[PRAVDA 21 Oct]* ... 74

Uzbekistan

Cyprus' Vasiliou Briefs Karimov on Cyprus Issue *[Nicosia Radio]* ... 74
    Karimov Cites Need for Republican Unity *[INTERFAX]* ... 74
Karimov Urges Account of USSR Foreign Debt *[Radio Rossii]* ... 75

Worldwide Issues

Reportage Continues on Gorbachev Madrid Visit

Bush, Gorbachev Meeting Previewed

PM3010124391 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 30 Oct 91 Union Edition p 1

[IZVESTIYA special correspondents V. Vernikov and A. Ostalskiy report under the general heading: "G. Bush and M. Gorbachev Meet in Madrid"]

[Text] Madrid—The day before flying to Madrid M. Gorbachev received a confidential message from Bush. We learned from circles close to the Soviet delegation that it contained a preliminary response to all the Soviet president's disarmament counterproposals without exception. The discussion starting in Madrid will undoubtedly speed up the process of dismantling the now-superfluous military structures and strengthening confidence and stability. It is also a question of formulating a "joint calendar" for concrete progress in tackling these problems.

European problems are allocated a considerable position here. The USSR and the United States in conjunction with the EC countries are engaging in active mediation with a view to finding a peaceful settlement to the conflict in Yugoslavia. This question will undoubtedly be broached when the presidents meet. The problem of Cyprus is also expected to be discussed.

Naturally, ahead of the opening of the Near East peace conference M. Gorbachev and G. Bush will pay particular attention to the Near East conflict, which the peace conference cochairmen hope to bring the world closer to resolving.

The visit to Madrid is M. Gorbachev's first trip abroad since the events of August. Indisputably our president now represents a different country from that which joined with the United States in advancing the idea of a Near East conference a few months ago. No one is in any doubt as to the purity of our intentions. But, commentators ask, the only question is whether the weakening Soviet Union will be strong enough to fully play its constructive role.

M. Gorbachev and G. Bush are to open the Near East peace conference on Wednesday. Before then the Soviet president will have at least one other important meeting in Madrid—with Y. Shamir. This will be the first time that a Soviet head of state will have met the head of the Israeli Government—there has been nothing like it in the history of our relations. The establishment of bilateral relations, including diplomatic relations, may also have a favorable effect on the progress of the conference itself, the Soviet delegation believes.

The preparatory diplomatic work will begin without the presidential cochairmen being present, following the solemn opening ceremony. We learned that the sessions' working table will be T-shaped. The intention is for the USSR and U.S. foreign ministers to sit at the head of the table—the former on the left and the latter on the right. Council of Europe observers will be seated on the left side of the table and then the Jordanian-Palestinian and Syrian delegations. Egypt's representatives and then the Israeli and Lebanese delegations will sit opposite them. So the Israelis will be facing their main antagonists, but there will be people on both sides of them with whom the Israelis have a more or less positive experience of diplomatic relations.

The supremely tangled elements of the Near East conflict are compounded by more and more problems jeopardizing the success of the conference. Thus, Israel is unhappy that the Jordanian-Palestinian delegation will have a double quota of time to set out both the Jordanian and Palestinian positions. It is no secret that, although the Palestinian representatives in Madrid officially have no ties with the PLO, nevertheless dialogue in the Spanish capital is virtually impossible without that organization's agreement.

Most observers agree that the conference will run to schedule during the first few days, but no one is yet venturing to say definitely whether it will succeed in making progress on the crucial problems or whether matters will be confined to mutual accusations and a "dialogue of the deaf."

Bush, Gorbachev Talks Assessed

LD3110101191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 31 Oct 91 Union Edition pp 1, 5

[Correspondents V. Vernikov and A. Ostalskiy dispatch: "IZVESTIYA Correspondents: Mikhail Sergeyevich, Who Is Currently Deputizing for You in Moscow? M. Gorbachev: Nobody"]

[Text] Madrid—The international forum which U.S. and Soviet diplomats have made such efforts to bring about has begun. The Near East peace conference has opened in Madrid.

At exactly 1030 in the morning conference, cochairmen USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev and U.S. President G. Bush, and Spanish Premier Felipe Gonzalez took their seats at a T-shaped table covered by a white silk cloth in the Hall of Columns at the Oriente royal palace. Also present were Soviet Foreign Minister B. Pankin, U.S. Secretary of State J. Baker, and Spanish Foreign Minister F. Fernandez-Ordonez.

Those present were welcomed by F. Gonzalez, who particularly noted the great work done by everyone—above all, the countries cochairing the conference—to make this meeting a reality. G. Bush and M. Gorbachev then took the floor. In their brief speeches, 12 and 15 minutes respectively, they called on the direct participants in the talks—the Arabs, Palestinians, and Israelis—to display patience, good will, and a desire for mutual understanding so as to justify the aspirations not only of their own peoples but of the whole world.

We would note one detail: The only flags on the table were those of the USSR and the United States as chairmen, but there were no flags in front of the heads of the participating countries' delegations. That was agreed beforehand to avoid any unnecessary discussions, given that the Palestinians are represented by a joint delegation with Jordan.

But before the conference opened world press attention was focused here on the talks between the Soviet and U.S. presidents, who made use of this "good opportunity" to "synchronize watches." That was how Mikhail Gorbachev described the Soviet-U.S. summit here when speaking at a joint news conference with George Bush at the Soviet Embassy.

After two and a half hours of talks the result of this "coordination" clearly satisfied the Soviet and U.S. presidents. Here is evidence of that: G. Bush stated that both sides' "timetables" were "very close, and we now have to work out the details and hold additional discussions," referring to nuclear disarmament issues. "There is no basis for either side to be concerned about large differences being revealed in the implementation of the stated initiatives," M. Gorbachev confirmed.

But the journalists were clearly disappointed—the news conference produced no sensations. And there was no comparison with the dramatic press conferences following previous summits—particularly those in Reykjavik and Geneva. But perhaps this ordinariness and our familiarity with summits is a sign of progress toward a more normal and safer world.

It was surprising that the journalists at the news conference virtually "forgot" to ask the presidents about the main reason they had come to Madrid—Near East affairs. The current complex domestic political situation in the Soviet Union and the way it is affecting Soviet-U.S. relations are questions of concern to all, and the subtext of many arguments on this score has been transparently negative. But, answering a question from your correspondents, George Bush said quite weightily:

"I have had very satisfactory talks with President Gorbachev in the past. Second, when the attempted coup occurred in the USSR, we came out against it. And, third, I see no difference between previous talks and the current talks as regards the degree of sincerity in our exchange of views. There is no difference—from my standpoint at any rate—in the level of respect for President Gorbachev.

"We in the United States have been following with admiration and acute interest the development of events in the Soviet Union and the full drama of the movement toward reform. I do not consider it necessary to react subtly to every detail of change in the Soviet Union. My task is to continue talks with President Gorbachev. And he is showing the necessary understanding, particularly as regards our contacts with representatives of the republics. We are following what is happening there. I was very happy to meet with my friend again and to have very fruitful talks with him—talks which were in no way influenced by the tragic events of August."

Consequently there is logic to the main conclusion drawn by observers on this surprisingly low-key news conference: The United States does not plan to change its policy regarding the Soviet Union at this critical time for the USSR. G. Bush clearly and emphatically called the Soviet president "my friend" and hinted that he intends to go on supporting Gorbachev. "At all costs," former Spanish Foreign Minister F. Moran said in a TV commentary on the Soviet-U.S. dialogue in Madrid, as if continuing the U.S. President's idea.

"At all costs" is, to our mind, an arguable and even rash claim. But, nonetheless, G. Bush stated at the press conference that the United States would indeed like to provide aid to the Soviet Union in the shape of food and medicines. As for more major economic aid, the U.S. President hinted that it is possible, since the United States is "very interested in promoting a continuation of the reform process" in the USSR. However, there is still no "concrete agreement on concrete levels" of aid, and Bush refused to adopt one before he had consulted with "G-7" experts.

The presidents did not go into disarmament problems in any particular depth. Admittedly, the information we had received the previous day to the effect that the U.S. President had responded to all the USSR president's counterproposals on this score (cf. IZVESTIYA No. 258) were confirmed. Judging by the tone of the speeches by M. Gorbachev and G. Bush, the Soviet side saw these responses as positive. The ball is now in the experts' court, and in the meantime both leaders have clearly decided to refrain from giving specific figures. "We agreed that two groups will be set up to discuss strategic stability issues, including views of the future," M. Gorbachev said.

Incidentally, we have jumped ahead slightly. G. Bush started his speech at the news conference with words of gratitude to the USSR for its "very constructive role" in the efforts which had led to the staging of the Near East conference. Nonetheless, the Spanish press—and not just the Spanish—has been putting forward a rather skeptical view of the importance of this role. Observers believe, on the one hand, that in the wake of the August events the USSR's position on a Near East settlement has become even more constructive than it was before. But, on the other hand, they doubt whether Moscow is capable of anything other than the role of "assistant" in the grand diplomatic operation being conducted in the Near East. Once again the arguments behind this conclusion are to be found in the unstable and difficult domestic situation in our country, which makes people fear for the future.

But, as if to reassure the doubters, M. Gorbachev said the following in response to a question from IZVESTIYA's correspondents about who is deputizing for him in Moscow during his foreign trip:

"I will answer briefly because the question is clear. Nobody is deputizing for me, I am executing my duties here. Everyone else is working and carrying out their functions. Was I calmer then or now? I have never lost my spiritual equilibrium—either then or now. I am sure that everything we are doing is necessary and I will do everything in my power. Nobody will succeed in diverting us from this path. The choice has been made."

Nonetheless, Madrid is currently experiencing a historic event—the opening of the conference. Observers agree that the conference participants, having paid such a high political price for their ticket to Madrid, are unlikely to allow any of its opponents to grab for the "emergency brake" now the train is under way. All the more so as M. Gorbachev and G. Bush gave assurances in almost the same words that the USSR and the United States will not "simply stand aside," although they will not impose their solutions on the conference participants.

On the eve of the conference M. Gorbachev had occasion to meet with Israeli Prime Minister Y. Shamir. Soviet presidential aide A. Grachev called this meeting "historic." In his words, the meeting was held in a good atmosphere. Incidentally, it was also highly assessed by the Israeli premier, who caused a sensation in Madrid by stating that "territory can be a subject for negotiation."

Observers "read into" these words a clear softening of the Israeli position. Y. Shamir's statement was also welcomed by the Palestinian representatives in the Spanish capital. This hopeful sign was unfortunately overshadowed by an act of terrorism against Israeli settlers on the West Bank. In a specially distributed statement here yesterday the USSR called the attack "shocking."

..."Flowers for the dialogue"—that is what Madrilenos are calling the 2 million flowers planted on the capital's streets to mark the start of the Near East peace conference. The Palestinians who flew in to the talks were bearing olive branches. Was this just a coincidence?

More on 30 Oct News Conference

LD3010155291 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1206 GMT 30 Oct 91

[Text] The Near East settlement conference is continuing in Madrid. Since yesterday, the Spanish capital has been added to the the already pretty widespread geography of summit meetings between the U.S. and USSR leaders. This time, the summit—the seventh in number—took place at the Soviet Embassy in Madrid. Nikolay Agayants comments:

[Begin Agayants recording] The approximately 5,000 journalists accredited to the international conference on a Near East settlement and representing the world's major publications, radio, and television companies, of course could not fail to take note of the latest meeting between Mikhail Gorbachev and George Bush, and of the news conference held on the meeting's results—nor did they, indeed. The general conclusion, to judge from the reactions we have so far had in from Madrid, is that the present Soviet-U.S. summit negotiations signify the continuation of the constructive dialogue which is being maintained and developed in spite of the most unexpected turns of events.

Indeed, the two-and-a-half-hour conversation between the USSR and U.S. presidents, with just their closest associates present, was useful, if only because for the first time since the collapse of the August putsch and the unprecedented initiatives by Washington and Moscow in the nuclear disarmament sphere, Bush and Gorbachev were able to exchange opinions on major problems of interest to the great powers. It is hard to judge just how constructive it was, since at the news conference both leaders gave pretty streamlined answers which were diplomatic to the utmost—which, in general, is understandable, for without careful study by experts of the existing problems, it is hard to expect concrete results. This relates both to further steps in the disarmament sphere, and, to an even greater degree, to measures for U.S. aid to the Soviet Union.

Bush was laconic and polite, saying: We discussed the USSR situation, the dynamic changes going on there, the adherence to the reform process which is still very strong. I can say that Mr. Gorbachev and I had a splendid meeting, the U.S. President stressed in his introductory address at the news conference.

Mikhail Sergeyevich was not left wanting in his reply, and also voiced his satisfaction at the conversation which had taken place. It was a convenient occasion to synchronize our watches and talk about issues of mutual interest for the Soviet Union and the United States; a big and very important conversation resulted, Gorbachev commented.

Let me remind you that on the eve of the summit, the mass media, especially the U.S. mass media, was making a great deal of mileage over rumors that the head of the White House would allegedly take to Madrid a number of packages of proposals for rendering weighty humanitarian aid to the USSR. Alas! After the summit meeting, this question became no more clear or comprehensible. Life throws up not a few problems.

In any event, I value the fact that fruitful, definite, businesslike, and promising results of cooperation are coming, Gorbachev said in answer to a pedantic CNN correspondent. We are currently at the stage of discussing details which assume the necessary concreteness. Further work is needed, as well as mutual consultations on this problem, taking as the point of departure the economic position of each of the sides, George Bush added with a smile. Has anyone got that? Personally, I didn't understand, and I don't think the CNN correspondent did, either. But since the sides voiced the desire to move forward, we shall wait and see what the outcome is.

Nikolay Agayants, Russian Radio News Service [Russ Rossiyskaya Sluzhba Radioinformatisyi] [end recording]

Bush Speaks at Peace Conference

LD3010185591 Moscow TASS in English 1503 GMT 30 Oct 91

[Text] Madrid October 30 TASS—"The time has come to end the war in the Middle East," President George Bush said during the opening of the Middle East peace conference here today. Noting Mikhail Gorbachev's contribution to the convocation of the forum, Bush said that nobody could have even imagined a short while ago that France and Germany would become allies, that the Berlin Wall would collapse, and the USSR and the United States would switch over from the "cold war" to cooperation.

Bush expressed hope that the Madrid conference would usher in a new chapter in the history of the Middle East, the inhabitants of which have experienced too much hatred and war sufferings.

The U.S. President urged the Arabs to show that they could live in peace with Israel. He also noted that Israel was getting a chance to start new relations with the Palestinians, based on mutual respect and cooperation. He confirmed the Palestinian's right to self-determination, which is compatible with the security of the Israeli State.

Bush went on record for direct negotiations between Israel and the Arab states, as well as between Israel and the Palestinians on the basis of United Nations Security Council Resolutions No. 242 and 338. The president stressed the importance of settling territorial issues. The United States, he recalled, has given written guarantees to all the sides concerned and is now prepared to render the necessary assistance in establishing a lasting peace.

PRAVDA Sees 'Success' at Talks

PM3110113291 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 31 Oct 91 pp 1, 4

[Report by special correspondents V. Volkov, T. Kolesnichenko: "The 'Star of David' Next to the Crescent Moon: Near East Peace Conference Opens in Madrid"]

[Text] Madrid—It began with a success, because its very opening can be considered a success. That observation is not a paradox, but a recognition of reality, because a breakdown was possible until the very last moment. Washington and Moscow, as a result of many years of efforts, have finally brought to the conference table those whom bloody enmity has divided for decades.

But if we are talking about success, let us go back to yesterday, which was marked by a meeting between the USSR and U.S. presidents. Success was in store for them too. Especially for M.S. Gorbachev. Contrary to the numerous predictions that the internal situation in the USSR and the weakening of presidential power in our country would inevitably affect the talks, this did not happen, in our view. Indeed, Bush, in his introductory address at the news conference and especially in his answers to journalists' questions, made a point of stressing his unchanged support for President Gorbachev and the equality and partnership between the USSR and the United States.

The list of problems discussed by the presidents in a working lunch lasting nearly three hours is in itself enough to take us back to the days when representatives of two great powers used to sit at the conference table. The list included problems of further disarmament (concrete proposals conveyed to one another), European security, the situation in Yugoslavia and Central America, the Cyprus situation, and, of course, the common approach to the settlement of the Near East conflict. All this makes it possible to conclude that, for all the flexibility of its relations with our republics, Washington is for the time being still backing the center, and regards our country as a single power.

But naturally, the common denominator in these discussions was a detailed briefing for Bush on the situation in our country and the prospects for the preservation of a single economic space and political union. And here, from our point of view, there is an important detail: On the one hand, Bush confirmed yesterday that U.S. humanitarian aid will be given to the USSR in response to Gorbachev's request, and will be sent to the center. On the other hand, the "aid package," it became clear, will not be offered here in Madrid. This question was postponed after all, and handed over to the experts for further study. Apparently Washington is still not clear who should be granted the aid and in what quantities, especially now that Russia has announced its own new radical economic reforms. At any event, many observers believe that this is no coincidence.

Yesterday M.S. Gorbachev also had a meeting with Israeli Prime Minister I. Shamir. At a briefing, the USSR president's press secretary described it as historic. One can agree with that, taking into account that there had never been a meeting between the two countries' leaders, but the severance of relations did no one any good. Moscow's one-sided orientation toward the Arab world only restricted Soviet diplomacy's room to maneuver. But today, when our life is so difficult, there is a concrete question on everyone's lips: What benefit will it be to us? The answer is not yet clear. Israel itself is an aid recipient; but all the same, there are prospects. Near the end of the talk Shamir said that now he understands the Russian language better than before, and he invited the Soviet president to visit Israel.

But let us come back to today. From early morning, everyone's attention was fixed on the royal Oriental Palace, where the opening ceremony was held. Since no one knows what will happen next, the thousands of journalists now gathered in Madrid are describing, so to speak, the environment: the security measures, the interior of the palace, the furniture, the symbolism of the conference—the "Star of David" and the crescent moon, the absence of flags on the table around which the meeting began (Israel does not recognize the Palestinians), and so forth.

However, from talking with members of the U.S. and Soviet delegations it is possible to form an idea of the strategic intentions of the conference organizers, their plans for its further progress. First, Washington and Moscow make a point of stressing that they do not intend to put any pressure on the participants in the talks. They have fulfilled their mission—to get the opposing sides to a single table—and now, they say, they wash their hands of it, and will leave Israel and the Arabs to resolve their own concrete problems. This does not, of course, mean that they are abandoning the participants in the talks to the whim of fate. When they left Madrid today, both Bush and Gorbachev left high-ranking observers behind, who will be "outside" the conference chamber, but will monitor progress attentively.

The main hope is that the longer the conference goes on, the greater the chance of success. There is hope that the negotiators, after initially adopting irreconcilable positions, will later begin to seek real points of contact, a "window of opportunity" will appear, and the logic of the talks will itself lead to compromise.

But danger lies in wait at every step. The main risk is that before the talks have really begun Israel and the Arabs will break off the conference, go home, and adopt their fighting stances again. For instance, Israel is suspected of only having agreed to take part in the conference because of U.S. economic blackmail. Now that it can count on the promised $10 billion, it will find reasons to wreck the peace talks.

And reasons are not far to seek. It is necessary only to recall the terrorist acts, as happened yesterday. If Shamir wants to leave the conference it will be easy for him to find a pretext. As for the Arabs, they could slam the door merely because Israel persistently repeats that it will make no territorial concessions—meaning the return of the occupied Arab lands. In that case, the question is, what is there to talk about at all?

There are many fears, but since one of them is already behind us—the conference has, after all, opened—hopes are also increasing. The first day is over, thanks be to Allah and the God of the Israelis. What next? Although there is no concrete "Bush plan," on the basis of his remarks it is possible to predict how he plans events. The conference should be in two phases. The first is what happened today: the opening ceremony and speeches by the USSR and U.S. presidents; and then direct talks, when representatives of Israel and Syria, Israel and Lebanon, and Israel and the Jordanian-Palestinian delegation will separately sit at the negotiating table. This second phrase could last months, or even years, in the quest for a solution to mutual problems that is acceptable to all sides. After Madrid, Washington believes that the talks could continue in the Near East or elsewhere in the world.

Will this plan be realized? Washington, however strong it may be, can in this instance only propose; those who dispose, who decide their own fate, are those who have gathered in Madrid today around a T-shaped table in the royal Oriental Palace.

PRAVDA Views Peace Efforts

PM3010125191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Oct 91 p 4

[Yuriy Glukhov "Viewpoint" article under the "Madrid Focus on the Near East" rubric: "Historic Act With a Touch of Razzmatazz"]

[Text] It appears that clocks in the Near East could switch to peacetime in the foreseeable future. For 43 years now they have been ticking away in wartime mode.

The hopes for peace are pinned on the conference on a Near East settlement that opens in Madrid today. The path to it has been agonizingly long. For a long time Washington was allergic to the idea of a conference, proposed by the Soviet Union, preferring separate talks. Only lately have the United States and the USSR synchronized their actions, hence the success, although the synchronization looked rather staged, when, some days ago, the Soviet and U.S. ambassadors in Arab countries were delivering invitations to the forum participants in tandem like Siamese twins.

But even now the peace efforts hang by a thread. In Lebanon in recent days I have again witnessed scenes of war, destruction, and outbreaks of violence. There has just been another terrorist act. An Israeli bus came under fire. A woman and a child were killed. The atmosphere of hostility continues to intensify. The Israeli leadership has taken a hard line. A new "rejection front" has been set up in Tehran. At a conference there, there was a call for an "Islamic holy war for the liberation of Palestine" and the boycotting of the peace conference in Madrid. All this feeds pessimism.

But the fog of hostility and extremism should not obscure the prime factor. The convening of the conference is a truly historic event. A massive psychological barrier of mutual enmity has been overcome. For the first time, all the participants in the Arab-Israeli conflict are gathering round the table of direct negotiations. Palestine, Syria, and Lebanon were not present at the Geneva conference in 1973.

The ice of confrontation and alienation freezing the entire Near East situation is beginning to thaw. This is exemplified by the complete restoration of diplomatic relations between Israel and the USSR. I did hear, however, many skeptical views on this from Arabs I spoke to. It was strange to meet with a pretty similar reaction from Israelis, claiming that it is all "late blossom," that who is more interested in this—Israel or the Soviet Union—is not known, and what exactly is the Soviet Union and who is its leader, anyway.

I am convinced that it was the USSR's position that sparked off the favorable development of the peacemaking process. To discount it now would be to cause adverse consequences. How balanced, independent, and based on the interests of its country and its people or peoples this position will be in the future is another matter. My interlocutors are right about one thing: The Soviet Union is not what it was, and our leader, in the international arena, looks like Antaeus, separated from his mother, the earth.

At the same time, the Soviet Union's loss of its former role had an unexpected side effect. It made the Arabs seek a path toward cohesion. Ties are being arranged between the PLO and Arab countries with which relations were spoiled during the Kuwait-Iraq conflict and before. PLO leader Y. 'Arafat visited Damascus for the first time since 1983 and was received by President H. al-Asad. The Arab conference participants met in the Syrian capital to coordinate their actions at the talks. I believe the United States and Israel will increasingly encounter a strengthening Arab factor in the future.

Despite the historic significance of the Madrid meeting there is a touch of Hollywood razzmatazz in it. U.S. diplomacy and its producers, G. Bush and J. Baker, are going for all the Near East "Oscars." For the best scenario, for the best production, even for being true to the theme. Success would not do Bush any harm on the threshold of next year's presidential election. Our president is hoping to share in this success in order to compensate somehow for domestic policy failures. Israeli Prime Minister Y. Shamir, who heads the Israeli delegation, having unceremoniously shoved his foreign minister out of the way, is also going for the prize. But it would be silly to consign the Arabs to the role of onlookers and extras.

So an historic act is to unfurl before our very eyes. Will it be the finale of the protracted Near East tragedy? One would like to think so. The conference participants did not come to the negotiating table in order to stare straight past one another. There was no point going to Madrid for that.

Gorbachev, Spain's Gonzalez Meet

*LD3010182491 Moscow TASS in English
1331 GMT 30 Oct 91*

[by TASS special correspondents]

[Text] Madrid October 30 TASS—Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev and Spanish Prime Minister Felipe Gonzalez held talks in the capital's Moncloa Palace today.

Addressing the press upon the completion of their talks, the two leaders highly assessed the current state of Soviet-Spanish relations and stressed the importance of implementing agreements reached during the last year summit and broadening economic cooperation.

Gorbachev and Gonzalez replied to journalists' questions.

Gorbachev-Gonzalez News Conference

*LD3110124491 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 0001 GMT 31 Oct 91*

[By TASS special correspondent]

[Text] Madrid, 31 Oct—At the conclusion of the Soviet-Spanish talks in the Moncloa Palace, USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev, and Felipe Gonzalez, prime minister of the Government of Spain, gave statements and replied to correspondents' questions.

President Gorbachev and I, said Felipe Gonzalez, had a very interesting conversation which started with an assessment of the peace conference on the Near East which has opened in Madrid. Then there was, in my view, an exceptional exchange of views on relations between the Soviet Union, Western Europe, and the whole world, and also on the evolution of events starting with August this year. Today, it is once again pleasant for me to receive President Gorbachev here. Before offering him the floor, I want once again to welcome him to Spain.

Expressing gratitude for the hospitality, M.S. Gorbachev said his conversations with Felipe Gonzalez have their history and their traditions. At the center of attention is the event taking place in the capital of Spain—the peace conference on the Near East. We agreed to continue to cooperate in order, through joint efforts, to preserve the atmosphere which took shape on the first day of this forum's work.

But we have to be realists, foreseeing that on the path of the process of talks concerning peace, bilateral and multilateral relations, and bilateral and regional problems, it will be necessary to overcome more than a few obstacles. In my view this is natural, since what is at issue is a very inveterate conflict, and the accumulated contradictions in the enormous region which is the Near East. This was the first part of our conversation.

I am satisfied with the understanding achieved in discussing this. Two-thirds of our time was devoted to the changing Europe, the changing world, the changing Soviet Union, and the changing Spain. Our dialogue has been going on for a long time. We have not only prepared information for each other, but also an analysis of the situation, and this was interesting and important. In any event, I am taking from this conversation a greater understanding of the position not only of Mr.Gonzalez, but also of his Western partners, a position which is important for me to know and to correctly understand. At the same time, I am counting on our position being known and correctly understood at this crucial stage of transformations in the Soviet Union and of those changes which have taken place in Europe. This is what we discussed. Now I will reply to questions of interest to you.

Spanish Radio's Russian service: A question for President Gorbachev and Prime Minister Gonzalez. How do you assess the role which Spain may play in building bridges between the USSR and the Western world?

Gonzalez: Inasmuch as the Soviet Union has already opened up channels of communication with the Western world, it has privileged relations with Western Europe and the United States. What contribution can we make? We of course are willing to make the maximum effort in order to achieve mutual understanding between the Union and the rest of the world. I proceeed from the position that the Soviet Union will be preserved in the full sense of this word. The USSR as a union is capable of being a conversation partner with the rest of the world.

I do not want to take part in spurious debates. To place a stake on the Union means to place a stake on protecting the interests of the country which I represent, and, I imagine, this is in the interests of Europe. Such a stake is completely compatible with respect and support for the democratic reforms in all the republics. If we are able in some way to help in clarifying for the Western world that this is a great stake on stability and cooperation, we are willing to do this. But, we cannot go beyond the borders of our own country and our own role. We are a medium-sized country: not so small for us not to be taken into account, but not so big for people to be afraid of us. Proceeding from the premise of a medium-sized country we want to carry out work which is aimed at mutual understanding, respect, and the development of cooperation.

Gorbachev: As a result of the reforms which are taking place in the country, the Soviet Union is developing with its face toward the rest of the world and has as its goal its organic inclusion in civilization and the world economy. This is a complicated process, it is a difficult process, and therefore we value political dialogue very highly and hope for cooperation in the sphere of disarmament and the building of new international relations which are being formed following the ending of the "cold war". In this I also see the role of Spain, the role of Felipe Gonzalez, head of its government. Spain possesses great potential possibilities for making a contribution to the formation of the new relations. The country is also at a stage of deep changes and its experience is of some use to us.

A question from the VANGUARDIA newspaper: Mr. President, I believe this is the first time you have met with Mr. Gonzalez since the attempted coup d'etat. You are aware of the interest and the feelings with which everyone followed the failed coup in your country. My question is this: Do you think such an action could be repeated in the Soviet Union?

Gorbachev: Your question allows me, first and foremost, to express gratitude for the solidarity which was shown by the government and his highness the king of Spain, and also the ministers who interrupted their leave and immediately traveled to the capital in order to study the crisis. The position of Spain, which was one of the first to take up a clear position, had an enormous influence. We are grateful for this solidarity shown by the government and people of Spain. I also must say that I received Mr. Prime Minister almost one month before the putsch. We had a very constructive conversation and various options were considered, and soon my book will appear where I mention this talk and where conclusions are drawn on the possible consequences of these events.

I asserted then, and I repeat again now, that my task was to bring the process of perestroyka to such a state where not only the possibility but also the attempt of a coup d'etat was ruled out. I think that in the main this succeeded: First, it proved possible to avoid a nationwide conflict and confrontation, and second, the democratic transformations and glasnost led to the putsch being rejected by the people.

Attempts at a coup d'etat will not succeed. The reactionary forces suffered a serious defeat. However, danger may arise out of the very tense social situation in society. The people are demanding radical changes. The dissatisfaction of the people is enormous. If positive changes do not ensue in the coming months, then disenchantment will take on forms which may again provide grounds for political adventurers to make attempts to impose coercive solutions. Our task is to get the reforms moving and to make use of the opportunity we received as a result of the collapse of the putsch.

Question from a Spanish correspondent: Not that long ago, each of your trips abroad seemed to give you an impetus to overcome domestic pressure. Is the same happening now? I would also like to know whether those who are receiving you do not have great difficulties in promising economic aid, because after 19 August you instill less confidence in your interlocutors.

M.S. Gorbachev: I think that since August everyone has been pondering the situation in the Soviet Union. Everyone regrets what happened. We have drawn a lesson from these events. A regrouping of political forces has now taken place. People are thinking about this, not only in the Soviet Union, but also here in Spain, in Europe, and throughout the world. I want to say that our cooperation after the events of August is marked by positiveness and fruitfulness. I note a rel desire to assist in implementing the reforms.

Question from the Italian news agency ANSA: President Gorbachev, we all admire Raisa Gorbacheva. I would like to know what influence she exerts on you, how does she inspire you? A second question: Your delegation includes the Tajik minister of foreign affairs. Does this mean that you recognize the independence of Tajikistan in the Soviet Union? A question to Felipe Gonzalez. The conference has opened, do you feel that it will make progress?

M.S. Gorbachev: It seems to me that the first question is already clear to everyone. Raisa Maksimovna Gorbacheva is my wife, with whom I have been associated for many decades. During the events my family stated the desire to share my fate. Yet, the right to make the decision always remained with me.

As regards the presence of the Tajik representative in the delegation, and also of Russia: I think the idea that I want to implement—and I hope for the support of my colleagues on the State Council, which includes representatives of all the republics—is that a renewed Union should transfer its plenipotentiary powers, should not be an amorphous state, but should have a clear structure, clear instruments for influencing the political, social, and economic situation. This will be a Union state with common attributes: common responsibility for defense, common responsibility for international policy, for elaborating an agreed policy in a unified economic zone, for elaborating the new "rules of the game" within a single market. So this presumes that the new center, the Union center, will be represented and formed by all the republics in order to reflect the new realities. Much is already being done. Evidence of this is the participation of the republics in discussing important international issues. The independence which republics have declared provides an opportunity to quite voluntarily make decisions on the formation of the new Union.

Gonzalez: You are demanding a very difficult answer from me, as you well know. I will venture to reflect on this a bit rather than give an answer. Only a couple of years ago it was difficult to imagine, speaking with various conversation partners—the Palestinians, the Syrians, the Jordanians, and the Israelis—that a dialogue would start at any time. It was difficult to imagine the setting which you observed this morning. It was also difficult just a few months ago. Yet today, for the first time in the past 43 years, we saw the conversation partners around the table for talks necessary to achieve peace and cooperation. A very important step has been taken.

I would like to tell you one thing: Do not draw hasty conclusions from the speeches which may be made today and tomorrow. Let us show a little patience with regard to a conflict which has lasted so many years. I have hope.

Soviet Television: A question to both leaders: Exactly one year ago in Moncloa, at just such a meeting, much was spoken about Soviet-Spanish relations, in particular about strengthening economic cooperation. I would like to know how the interethnic problems emerging in the Soviet Union may influence cooperation.

Gorbachev: So far, this has not happened. The word given by the head of the Spanish Government is confirmed by real facts. This cooperation is gaining strength. I am very satisfied that cooperation with this country, with which we had no relations for a long time, is now developing successfully. Today we have confirmed that we will continue it. Moreover, the Soviet Union is now counting on great support. I think Mr. Gonzalez is a supporter of the democratic transformations in our country.

Gonzalez: Our desire in this area is clear. A year ago I said and I confirm now: At times we are alarmed that the channels for effective cooperation are not yet sufficiently ready, and for this reason, from the viewpoint of Spain and the European Community, we want these channels to be improved and cooperation really to be strengthened.

Question from Japanese television: What specific agreement have you not reached within the framework of cooperation with Spain and today's talks?

Gorbachev: There has been no such problem in our current talks.

A question from the same correspondent: And in the economic sphere? During today's talks, you did not reach specific agreement with regard to economic cooperation with Spain?

Gorbachev: As it happens, I can say that this problem did not exist today. There was complete mutual understanding. When new problems emerge, we will consider them.

Gonzalez: I want to make it clear that we have a treaty which already provides for specified credits which have already been set up. It is already functioning alongside our obligations to the European Community which are also specified and functioning. So the issue is not that we should achieve an agreement now. The thing is that we are already implementing an existing treaty, and, of course, difficulties of an exclusively technical nature arise on the way. But between us there are no doubts that all this is working, and, I hope, will function better and better.

This was the penultimate question. The last question now please.

Question from a Spanish journalist to President Gorbachev: Do you feel that the role which the Soviet Union is playing in convening this peace conference is secondary compared to the role of the United States?

Gorbachev: It is not entirely appropriate for me to provide a description of the Soviet Union's role. Yet I will venture—although I have no ambitions on this score and only to reflect the reality—I think that this role is irreplaceable. This has been said both by Mr. Gonzalez and Mr. Bush, both publicly and in our conversations. I do not want to adduce evidence here. This is obvious.

Gonzalez: I will advise you of an additional fact. The participants in the talks in this region feel likewise. I have been able to satisfy myself of this since the participants in the Madrid conference themselves have said this to me.

Gorbachev, Rome Club Chairman Meet

LD3010210491 Moscow TASS in English
2052 GMT 30 Oct 91

[by TASS special correspondent]

[Text] Madrid October 30 TASS—On the last day of his stay in Spain, President Mikhail Gorbachev received Ricardo Diez Hoehleitner, president of the Rome Club, an influential non- governmental international organization, which unites scientists, public figures and politicians from over 50 states.

Hoehleitner told Mikhail Gorbachev his organisation is striving to contribute to the deepening of peaceful cooperation between all states of civilized society.

He expressed hope that the policy of perestroyka and glasnost will continue. The Rome Club president noted that the modern capitalist society also needs a perestroyka. That is why both the Soviet Union and western nations are interested in cooperation.

One of the major tasks is to upgrade the system of education, that is to prepare new generations for perception of the modern world from global positions, instead of having narrow nationalistic or ethnic outlooks.

Mikhail Gorbachev supported and developed this idea. He noted that education acquires top priority meaning in the Soviet Union.

Environmental protection problems were also discussed.

Gorbachev Seeks To Assert Status

PM3010205591 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
31 Oct 91 Union Edition p 5

[Stanislav Kondrashov "Political Observer's Opinion": "Last Tango in Madrid?"]

[Text] Mikhail Gorbachev's main task in Madrid has not been to reconcile the Arabs and Israelis, but—as cochairman of the conference that has opened—to appear on a par with George Bush as leader of a superpower. That is his main task, and an unfulfillable one. No diplomatic protocol or joint news conferences should make us lose sight of the not very pleasant thought that our whole status in the world is different now and, of course, the status of the USSR president, who still regards himself as our common president of the USSR, although the USSR no longer exists, is also different.

Three months ago now, when Gorbachev and Bush met in Moscow, the claims to equality looked artificial, to put it mildly. But Gorbachev did still surpass Yeltsin in terms of real power then. Now the correlation of forces here has clearly changed. The day the USSR president left for Madrid our attention was riveted on the RSFSR president's speech in the Congress of Russian People's Deputies. Yeltsin delivered the coup de grace to the center and with a sense of almost desperate determination flung wide-open the gates to the market economy and a quite different society.

On that day Yeltsin tried on the onerous crown of office. It is just as heavy as that which bowed Gorbachev. But it is of a different style. Even if reform, with its great ordeals for tens of millions of people, pushes its way through those aforementioned gates and even if the crown stays on the victor's gray head, this will no longer be the headgear of the leader of a superpower. There is no point in cherishing any illusions here, although, of course, in a democratic system of society superpower status cannot, as under our buried totalitarianism, be an end itself.

Somewhere in the early eighties, at one of those turning points in the endless process of Soviet-U.S. arms reduction talks, Ronald Reagan used the popular expression, "It takes two to tango." This clearly is Gorbachev's last tango. Different dances will be performed in the future. We are no longer the partner of recent time or the rival we were for a long time. To call a spade a spade, the United States has become our patron. And one of the few things that unite all the nestlings who have hatched out the shell of the former empire—all the leaders of the new states—is the quest for U.S. patronage. This unites, but also forces them to vie with one another to see who can secure the most favorable attitude on the part of the transatlantic superpower and the West as a whole.

Disarmament problems have not run dry, which Madrid has shown. But instead of the multilateral global imperative of self-preservation in the face of nuclear-borne death, a one-sided imperative affecting only us now operates: Surviving the trials of winter and next year in conditions which, as has been made plain, will get worse worse before they get better, although more than half the people live below the poverty line in Russia even now.

As far as the winter is concerned, Bush promised before Madrid that they (that is, we) will not starve. The promise was given after conversing with U.S. Deputy Minister of Agriculture Madigan [title as published], who recently made a trip with a group of experts around a number of regions of the former Soviet Union. The U.S. inspectors discovered that the problem was not so much a shortage of food (there is enough of it, in their view) as in the general chaos, confusion, and power vacuum, which prevents proper food distribution. Hence the guarded, if not skeptical, attitude in Washington toward the new requests for credits and aid issuing from Moscow. There is snow outside, but they keep dragging their feet all the time.

Friendship is friendship, but money makes you fall out.... In the rapture of our newly acquired common ideals we are completely unable to grasp that this iron principle operates in the Western democracies and that their world is built upon it. Our reputation in this world, alas, continues to decline along with our solvency. The G-7 deputy finance ministers who came to Moscow after Yavlinskiy's recent trip to Bangkok did of course want to get a better idea of our needs. But the main thing they sought an answer to was—do we kiss our money good-bye or not? This money, as reported, already comes to $68 billion in the shape of the Soviet Union's foreign debts.

Who will pay the debts now when the Union no longer exists? Meeting across one large table with representatives of the 12 new sovereign states, the G-7 emissaries received assurances of a general nature. There can be no other kind now. So, is it good-bye to their money or not? Only the future will tell. But such an answer is not going to enthuse our Western creditors. The biggest and most well-disposed of them—Germany—is behaving increasingly cautiously and is going to start openly expressing its displeasure at any time. The U.S. proposal to defer Soviet loan payments for 6-12 months has run into opposition in Germany because the Germans lose several times more than the Americans do from this.

A state of uncertainty reigns in an even more important question—nuclear arms. Gorbachev assures Bush that the START Treaty, signed three months ago, will be ratified in the USSR Supreme Soviet. But what is the cost of ratification to the Supreme Soviet? The practical implementation of the treaty now depends on the republics, above all the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic. The question of control over nuclear weapons has become even more involved insofar as the Ukraine has not finally decided whether to tranfer the part of the arsenal on its territory to Russia or not, and it along with Kazakhstan claims the right to veto their potential use. The bid of the Ukraine, and not just the Ukraine, to create national armies threatens to complicate the matter even more.

That is the way the last tango in Madrid looks. Neither partner is to be envied.

Another partner from Moscow will now be increasingly noticeable in the international arena. Groups preparing Boris Yeltsin's visits to Bonn and Paris are already at work. The Russian president already has an invitation to visit Rome. He has announced his proposal to cut the strength of the USSR Foreign Ministry apparatus by a factor of roughly 10, and Gorbachev is powerless to resist. Russia is entering into direct ties with other states, although it does not for the time being intend to open up its own embassies everywhere.

We should not delude or kid ourselves here. The new venture will be just another new unknown venture for us, and in the sophisticated capitals of the world Russia will be accepted as a beginner, a callow novice, albeit of giant proportions.

Commentary on Possible Peace

LD3010200491 Moscow Radio Moscow in Arabic 1500 GMT 30 Oct 91

[Dimitriy Prokofiev commentary: "Is a move toward peace possible from the Madrid conference on the Middle East?"—read by announcer]

[Excerpts] Today is the first day of the Madrid international conference on the settlement in the Middle East. We present you with an article by our commentator entitled "Is a move toward peace possible from the Madrid conference on the Middle East?".

In this article, he gives his opinion on the situation arising from the Madrid conference:

Israeli journalists polled Knesset members representing the various political forces on the eve of the official opening of the Middle East peace conference about the possibilities of moving toward a settlement in the region within the framework of this international conference. The results of this poll were very pessimistic. The views of the left-wingers and right-wingers were identical. [passage omitted]

The commentator says: Naturally, we do not doubt that the leaders of the Arab countries and Israel have seriously prepared themselves for the negotiations, otherwise the leaders of the concerned countries would not have come to the conference. However, when they verbally agreed to settling the problems by peaceful means, the sides immediately aroused tension and blocked with their own hands the way along which they should proceed.

The first blow was directed by the Arab radicals during the few days before the conference when they undertook a series of terrorist actions—some of them against civilians. There is no doubt that the PFLP [Patriotic Front for the Liberation of Palestine] and the Hezbollah organization are not official representatives of the Arab world.

However, the Madrid conference is about a settlement between Israel and the Arab world in general. As long as forces which do not talk except in the language of machineguns and bombs are at work in the Arab world, peace in the region seems to be the most difficult problem.

Dimitriy Prokofiev says: The situation is no better on the other side of the fence. The Israeli settlers movement announced that they are commencing the building of two new settlements in the West Bank. [Name indistinct], Knesset member for the ruling Likud coalition, said that the reaction to the attack by George Habash's troops on Monday was a sharp increase in the number of youths who asked to be housed in the occupied territories.

There is no doubt that the settlers are not yet the official representatives of Israel, but when Yitzhaq Shamir refused to freeze the building of settlements during the negotiations period he gave the settlers the green light.

This way, on the opening of the Middle East conference the two sides have simultaneously laid at least two timed landmines. It seems that they hope for a settlement under some external pressure. The commentator concluds his comment by saying: History proved a long time ago that an imposed peace is nothing but an introduction for a new war. Therefore, the Middle East countries have to find compromises by themselves and give mutual concessions.

Pogodin Commentary on Conference

LD3110144291 Moscow Radio Moscow World Service in English 1310 GMT 31 Oct 91

[Commentary by Aleksandr Pogodin]

[Text] Aleksandr Pogodin has been following the course of the Middle East peace conference in Madrid. His forecast for the conference's future:

[Pogodin] Both optimistic and pessimistic forecasts are so far coming true at the conference. It is to the conference's credit that the Soviet Union and the United States are willing to co-chair it so as to help the conflicting parties find a way toward accord and peace.

Presidents Gorbachev and Bush have stressed their countries see eye to eye on the Arab-Israeli conflict. After decades of all-out backing to the warring factions the two powers have given up the policies of confrontation to help settle the conflict. Their positions used to encourage extremists and made the local situation all the more inflammable. Now that Moscow and Washington have replaced confrontation with cooperation and partnership they can launch what the Soviet president described as a joint and energetic attack on the problem.

The attack continues in Madrid. But the Soviet Union and the United States are determined to limit their involvement in the conflict to the offer of good offices. They have no intention of imposing on the Arabs or Israel decisions which would run counter to their national interests. It is not for the conflicting parties to solve the regional problem, and President Bush has stressed that peace can be achieved only through direct negotiation and compromise.

The pessimistic forecasts, however, focus on a number of pending problems. The first presentations at the conference have shown the conflicting sides are just as inflexible as before. Although they are reportedly trying to negotiate a settlement, they have conditioned their commitment to peace by the toughest ultimatums and say they will walk out on the conference if their conditions fail to be met. A new wave of regional violence adds heat to that problem.

Nevertheless, all participants in the Middle Eastern conflict have for the first time in these 40 odd years sat down together to talk peace. And this outweighs pessimism and will hopefully enable the negotiating sides to crown the conference with peacemaking decisions.

Even though the conference is likely to be long and difficult, the region should lose no chance for peace.

PRAVDA on Peace Plan Agenda

PM3010170191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Oct 91 p 4

[Account under the "Madrid Focus on the Near East" based on reports by correspondent V. Belyakov: "What They Will Be Discussing and How"]

[Text] The conference's work will be conducted as follows: On Thursday and Friday, plenary sessions will be addressed by the heads of the participating delegations from Israel, Egypt, Syria, Lebanon, and the joint Jordanian-Palestinian delegation. The latter merits special attention, because its formation aroused a great deal of excitement.

Back in 1974, the UN General Assembly recognized the PLO as the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people, and it appeared that it would be participating in the conference independently. Israel, however, was categorically opposed to this concept, and it was then that the compromise of a joint Jordanian-Palestinian delegation was born. Israel even put forward a whole range of conditions for that formula. In the first place, the delegation would include only representatives from the West Bank and Gaza Strip—the Palestinian territories occupied by the Israelis since 1967. Second, none of them could have direct links with the PLO.

The Palestinians met these conditions—but the official delegation also includes seven advisers, of whom three are Palestinian exiles and two are from East Jerusalem, which has been annexed by Israel. It is no secret that these people represent PLO interests; in fact, Palestinian leader Yasir 'Arafat actually said so.

The conference is the principle event of a three-stage "peace process," where the sides will only set out their initial positions. The next stage—direct bilateral talks—is to start on 2 November. Israeli-Syrian, Israeli-Lebanese, and Israeli-Jordanian-Palestinian committees will be set up. Egypt, which signed a peace treaty with Israel back in 1979, will not participate in this stage of the talks. The plan is for the first sessions of the bilateral committees to be held in the Spanish capital as well. The participants themselves will decide where future talks are to be held.

According to the scenario worked out by the Americans, the third stage of the "peace process" is to begin two weeks after the second. It will consist of multilateral talks on regional issues—such as a security system, the arms race, refugees, ecology, use of water resources, drug addiction, and so on. The fate of this stage of the "peace process," in which Israel is particularly interested, will largely be decided by bilateral talks. At any rate, Syria has already said that it will not participate in multilateral talks until real progress has been made on the question of the withdrawal of Israeli forces from the Arab lands occupied in 1967.

The participants have agreed that two UN Security Council resolutions—242, from 22 November 1967, and 338, from 22 October 1973—will form the basis of the Madrid conference and the "peace process" as a whole. Considering the fundamental importance of these documents, we will quote their main provisions.

From Resolution 242:

the withdrawal of Israeli armed forces from territories occupied during the recent conflict;

the discontinuation of all claims and of the state of war and respect for and recognition of the sovereignty, territorial integrity, and political independence of every state in the region and their right to live in peace, within secure and recognized borders, without being subject to the threat or use of force.

As for Resolution 338, in this brief document the Security Council "urges interested parties immediately to begin...the practical implementation of Resolution 242...in all its parts." It also "decrees the immediate commencement of...talks between interested parties under the appropriate auspices, geared to the establishment of a just and lasting peace in the Near East."

The sides' positions: The Arab participants in the conflict are convinced that these resolutions establish the principle of "peace for land." But Israel insists on its own interpretation of Resolutions 242 and 338, claiming that they do not compel it to withdraw forces from the West Bank, the Gaza Strip, the Golan Heights, or East Jerusalem.

There were particularly fierce disagreements over Jerusalem. Formally, none of it belongs to Israel. According to UN General Assembly Resolution 181 of 29 November 1947, which revoked the British mandate over Palestine and established two independent states—Arab and Jewish—on its territory, Jerusalem was made an autonomous administrative unit. During the first Arab-Israeli war of 1948-1949, West Jerusalem passed to Israeli control and East Jerusalem to Jordanian control. In June 1967, Israel seized East Jerusalem, formally annexed it a month later, and, in 1980, declared the forcibly reunited city its "eternal and indivisible capital." The Israeli Government will not contemplate leaving the eastern part of the city, but, for the Arabs, control of it is a matter of fundamental importance, as the holy places there are not only of Judaism, but also are of Christianity and Islam.

As far as the Palestinian issue is concerned, the U.S. "peace process" scenario, which has not been rejected by any side, is as follows: The talks in the Israeli-Jordanian-Palestinian committee will concern the establishment of autonomy for the Palestinians on occupied lands for a period of five years. Describing this autonomy, NEWSWEEK has written that the Palestinians, according to Shamir, "will obtain the right to decide what they are going to eat for dinner today." In the third year of autonomy, talks will begin on the final status of the occupied territories. The United States has stipulated that, like Israel, it does not support the idea of creating an independent Palestinian state there. As for the Palestinians, they proclaimed an independent state of Palestine on the lands seized by Israeli in 1967 back on 15 November 1988. This state, which so far exists only on paper, has nonetheless been recognized by over 100 countries.

The Arab sides participating in the "peace process" have agreed to coordinate their actions. The main thing, in their opinion, is that no side should conclude separate treaties with Israel.

Moscow Forum Views 'Architecture'

PM2810113191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 28 Oct 91 Union Edition p 3

[Report by A. Portanskiy: "Peace Is Possible, the Near East Settlement Experts Believe"]

[Text] And it is by no means banal, this conclusion by the participants of the past week's Moscow international conference on problems of cooperation in the sphere of Near East security, which was organized on the initiative of Soviet and U.S. academic circles with the participation of representatives of Arab countries, Israel, European countries, and Canada.

I do not think there is any need to reiterate once again what enormous effort and time it took to organize the peace conference on a Near East settlement, due to open 30 October in Madrid. But now that the invitations have been sent out and the relevant parties have agreed to attend, there is no absolute certainty that fierce clashes will not occur during the upcoming talks, as well as unexpected conflict situations due to ill-judged statements and other unpredictable events as a result of which the future talks process could be jeopardized. The Arabs' and Israelis' positions on the most important questions of a peace settlement in the region have been too far apart and too mutually irreconcilable for too long.

It was to work out possible advice, ideas, and recommendations that might insure the Madrid conference against any breakdowns and ensure that it continues even if the situation at the negotiating table deteriorates that the eminent experts, academics, former diplomats, and military people from various countries assembled in Moscow. Did they manage to complete their mission?

"Our conference was attended by well-known experts on methods of mediation and settlement of regional conflicts," Andrey Shumikhin, Soviet cochairman of the Moscow forum, said in conversation with me. "They approach their work on the premise that there is no such thing as an insoluble conflict, that it is important to use the mediation mechanism correctly. We elaborated a number of recommendations that might contribute to the creation of a generally favorable psychological atmosphere and the right mood on the part of the individual delegates to the Madrid conference. For example, it would be desirable to adopt at the very start of the conference a declaration based on the motives that the participating sides have in common. It might state that the sides will seek a settlement in the Near East irrespective of any obstacles that might arise during the talks. The point is that international experience of talks on resolving crises unfortunately shows many examples where one participant or another has "slammed the door." So there need to be guarantees of some kind against such actions.

The following question is also very important: To what extent will the Madrid talks participants proceed on the basis of the interests of keeping the talks going and not on the basis of the reaction of public opinion at home? Just imagine: You are about to settle on a reasonable compromise, when someone at home hastily accuses you of being too soft and ignoring national interests. It was with this in mind that we adopted a recommendation that the talks be confidential for the most part, particularly in the early stage of the conference.

The Moscow forum's brainstorming on the problem of the future Near East peace conference also involved the original practice of playing a situational game modeled on the start of the Madrid conference. General Aaron Yariv, once a prominent military and political figure and now head of the strategic research center in Tel Aviv, played the part of Israeli premier Y. Shamir in it.

"In fact, it was an entirely successful and useful exercise," General A. Yariv said in conversation with me. "The 'game,' like the Moscow conference as a whole, gave one a better, comprehensive picture of the problems of the Near East. You find a multitude of approaches and viewpoints on the same matter. This makes you think most seriously about the architecture of the Madrid conference, about how carefully we have to prepare for it. For example, there are questions that cannot be raised right away, but only discussed at a later stage of the talks."

[Portanskiy] How do you see the problem of Palestinian representation at the Madrid conference?

[Yariv] The problem of Palestinian representation has to be and will be solved. In my personal opinion, if the PLO wants to attend the peace conference it has to do one very simple thing—abandon the section of the 1964 Palestine National Charter which says that Israel has no right to exist. And it must be an official statement.

[Portanskiy] What is your prognosis regarding the Near East peace conference?

[Yariv] It is likely to be long and very difficult. Internal crises in the participating countries, including Israel, cannot be ruled out either. Nor can we forget about the danger of terrorism—it is possible both on the Arab side and on the Israeli side. But, for all that, we can achieve a peace which is equally essential to Israel and the Arabs.

USSR's Madrid Role Affirmed

PM3010154391 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Oct 91 p 4

[Report by PRAVDA special correspondents V. Volkov and T. Kolesnichenko under the "Madrid Focus on the Near East" rubric: "Operation 'Peace'"]

[Text] Madrid, 29 Oct—The words in the headline have no political meaning, as this phrase is the code name for the increased security measures that the Spanish authorities have taken for the Madrid visits of the Soviet and U.S. presidents and the Near East peace conference.

Some 10,000 police and Civil Guard officers and security service agents have been sent to the capital. The Soviet Embassy was "frozen" the moment President Gorbachev arrived there, as we saw for ourselves when we tried to get through. We needed special passes. Police have surrounded all entrances to the Oriente royal palace, where the conference is to be held. Supplies of blood have been delivered to Madrid hospitals.

However, Operation "Peace" is extending beyond the confines of security measures and is acquiring a highly symbolic significance. One could say it is divided into two stages. The first is the Soviet-American summit, and the second is the opening of the Near East peace conference.

Today—and we are transmitting this report at midday—has in fact been given over entirely to the Soviet-American talks, which are underway in the Soviet embassy building. There will be a joint press conference later on, but we will write about that tomorrow. Today we can discuss the theme that most political observers consider to be the primary one: How does this meeting between Bush and Gorbachev differ from previous ones; what is the nature of Soviet-American relations at the present stage; what is the USSR's policy in the Near East; and what exactly is the Soviet Union's role at the Madrid peace conference?

Many questions, different answers. But one thing is clear (and we would very much like those who are destroying the USSR, those who are drunk with nationalism, to be here today): Our country's authority as a great power is taking a nose dive. In the opinion of many observers, the Soviet Union has a purely decorative role at this conference. Moscow, they believe, can no longer exert any real influence on its former allies and is constantly having to take its lead from Washington in its Near East policy.

But one could argue with the latter point. Those who say that Soviet policy is "subordinate" to Washington's tend to be people who were unable to totally restructure themselves after the cold war ended. It was all clear in those days: What benefits Washington does not benefit us. If Bush wants a conference, then we must oppose it... The arrangement of forces in the Near East was clear: The United States supported Israel, and the USSR supported the Arabs. A confused Spanish journalist asked us: "Who is pressuring the Arabs today, and who is pressuring Israel? Moscow or Washington?" Who, indeed?

We believe that the Soviet and U.S. presidents are currently exchanging opinions on this theme—to be precise, on the theme of the concrete quest for peace in the Near East. If Moscow and Washington find a common language, it by no means signifies that Soviet foreign policy is undergoing "Americanization"; it is more a reflection of the new reality of the current stage of Soviet-American relations, of their move from confrontation to partnership. There is more to the common ground between the two powers than this, of course. As long as we have nuclear weapons, and they are controlled by the center, the USSR is "doomed" to be a great power. The disarmament process, for all its successes, has only just begun. Both countries still have mountains of nuclear weapons in their arsenals. The presidents have plenty to discuss. Indeed, every new step in the direction of the elimination of nuclear weapons is another step toward strengthening international security.

But we must admit that all our arguments, alas, are drowning in the flood of pessimistic articles in the Western and in our own press. Indeed, it is hard to dispute their main argument: Since work began on convening this peace conference, the situation in the USSR has deteriorated, the processes of disintegration have continued, and economic chaos has reached disastrous proportions.

Scenarios are thus emerging which would definitely be described as fantastic under normal circumstances. For example, NBC television company, which is here, has asked the question: "Why is it important to the United States that Israel, its Arab neighbors, and the Palestinians should begin talks?" Anchorman Tom Brokaw has provided the answer, developing this idea: If Israel gets into trouble, the United States will be drawn into it as well. But, unlike the trouble of the past, the next conflict could be nuclear. Here are the signs: Israel possesses nuclear weapons and means of delivering them, while the chaos in the Soviet Union could mean that its nuclear weapons will get into irresponsible hands, for example, Arab hands. Hence the danger of a nuclear war in the Near East. The United States, as Israel's main ally—or arms supplier—will be involved in this war in one way or another. So, Brokaw concluded, the Americans need peace in the Near East.

We would have laughed at this scenario yesterday, but, for some reason, it is no longer funny today if only because it reflects the universal fear of the uncontrolled processes taking place in our country.

But we are prepared to dispute these scenarios as well as the negative assessment of the Soviet Union's role at this conference. Had it not been for the events in our country that began in 1985 and the change in the nature of Soviet-U.S. relations, the convening of the conference would have been totally impossible. Washington and Moscow would have defended their "ideological corners," without moving from their positions, keeping a close watch on the positions of their allies in the Near East, according to the principle of never stepping aside.

It is the principle of unraveling the very complicated knots in Soviet-American relations that has made it possible today to set about resolving the most ingrained and involved conflicts. It was implemented successfully in Nicaragua, Angola, and Cambodia, and now it is the Near East's turn.

PLO Envoy Comments on Peace Conference

OW3010173891 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1619 GMT 30 Oct 91

[By diplomatic correspondents Mikhail Mayorov and Igor Porshnev; from the "Diplomatic Panorama" (DP) feature; following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] On October 3O, a peace conference on the Middle East opened in Madrid. On the eve of the event, envoy extraordinary of the embassy of the state of Palestine in the USSR, Mr. Sa'id 'Abu-Imarah, gave an exclusive interviev to DP.

"We would like the conference to be a success," said Said Abu Imara. He praised the Soviet Union's and the United States' efforts to convene the conference and acknowledged that it was really not easy to bring together the Arabs and the Israelis at one negotiating table.

He said that the Palestine Liberation Organization had agreed to participate in the conference as a member of a joint Palestinian-Jordanian delegation in hope for achieving stable and just peace in the Middle East. Such peace can and must be established. Peaceful coexistence of all states of the region is quite possible, he said.

Mr. Said Abu Imara said that the Middle East settlement must be based on the principles which had made it possible to convene the Madrid conference. What is meant here, he said, is the Security Council's Resolutions No. 242 and 382. In other words, only the principle "peace in exchange for land" can radically improve the situation in the region. He stressed that the PLO did not advance any preliminary terms, and was only insisting on the implementation of this principle and the observation of the generally-accepted norms of international law.

In his opinion, it was vitally important that the Soviet Union and the U.S., as co-chairmen of the Madrid conference, interpret the above-mentioned resolutions of the Security Council and the principle "peace in exchange for land" in the same way. As to the Arab participants in the conference, they have arrived in Madrid with one understanding of these resolutions and of the fundamental principle of settlement.

The position of Israel was the main obstacle hampering the conference's way to success, said the Palestinian diplomat. He said that Israel interpreted the Security Council resolutions in its own way, different from the interpretation of other members of the world community. In fact, Israel rejects the possibility of implementing the "peace in exchange for land" principle, he said. Such a position may frustrate the talks, he added.

Another obstacle to peace in the Middle East was the construction of Israeli settlements in the occupied Arab territory, said the Palestinian diplomat. Further implementation of this policy may torpedo and possibly wreck the peace conference on the Middle East, he said.

Asked about the emigration of Soviet Jews to Israel, the Palestinian diplomat said Palestinians were not against emigration as such. However, no one's rights should be exercised at the expense of the rights of others, he added. As to Israel, he continued, it sends Soviet Jews in the occupied Arab territory with the sole purpose of perpetuating its occupation. Mr. Sa'id 'Abu-Imarah expressed hope that ultimately a link between the emigration of Soviet Jews to Israel and Middle East settlement would be found.

He expressed the opinion that at the conference Israel would act from tough and possibly extremist positions. He also noted that Yitzhaq Shamir's decision to lead the Israeli delegation to Madrid was the confirmation of this, which pointed to disagreements in the Israeli leadership. Obviously said Mr. Said Abu Imara, Israeli Foreign Minister David Levy, who was to lead the Israeli delegation and in experts' estimate, could assume a more flexible radical position, has lost the prime minister's trust.

The Palestinian diplomat expressed the view that Israel could put up other obstacles on the conference's way to success. For instance, Israel may continue to insist that the talks be moved from Madrid to the Middle East. "The place of the talks is not the most important thing, of course, on the condition that the sides really aspire for peace," he said.

Mr. Sa'id 'Abu-Imarah expressed confidence that Israel's security cannot be ensured by force of arms or by occupation of the Arab lands. It can only be ensured by the achievement of comprehensive peace in the Middle East. The diplomat's words suggested the understanding that objectively Israel was also interested in the success of the Madrid conference. Its failure, he said, is fraught with unpredictable consequences. He also said that in that case blood could be shed in the Middle East once again.

Sa'id 'Abu-Imarah noted he did not know how long the talks may last. It was only clear that they would be rather long and complicated. As to the length of the talks, it will primarily depend on the sides' aspiration for peace.

Assessing the restoration of Soviet-Israeli diplomatic relations, Mr. Said Abu Imara said that "this is the Soviet Union's internal affair." He said that by severing diplomatic relations with Israel in 1967, the Soviet Union was putting pressure on Israel to make it withdraw from the occupied Arab territory. He expressed hope that the Soviet Union would use the restoration of diplomatic relations as "an additional factor" of "urging Israel to implement the Security Council resolutions, and other resolutions of the UN." "We would not like Israel to look at the restoration of diplomatic relations with the USSR as a reward for its position in the Middle East," he said in conclusion.

Egyptian Envoy Views Peace Prospects

92UF0120A Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA in Russian 29 Oct 91 p 3

[Interview with Egyptian Ambassador Ahmad Mahir al-Sayyid, ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary of the Arab Republic of Egypt, by Vladimir Mikhaylov; place and date not given: "The World Awaits Peace on This Land"]

[Text] *The conference on a Near East settlement opens on 30 October in Madrid. It is being organized by the United States and the Soviet Union. Syria, Israel, Egypt, Jordan, Lebanon and Palestinians, as part of a joint Jordanian-Palestinian delegation, will take part in the forum. The arrival in the Spanish capital of representatives of the EC and the Gulf Cooperation Council is scheduled, in addition.*

The first general stage will last three days. The second will be Israel's bilateral negotiations with Syria, Lebanon and the other Arab delegations. If difficulties arise and the parties request assistance, the USSR and the United States will undertake to coordinate the negotiations. The third stage will incorporate negotiations on a cessation of the arms race, distribution of water resources and problems of the environment.

On the eve of the start of the conference our special correspondents requested of the heads of the diplomatic missions of Egypt, Israel, and Jordan an assessment of the significance of the upcoming conference. The Jordanian charge d'affaires ad interim declined a meeting, citing pressure of business.

The interview with Israeli Ambassador A. Levin will be published tomorrow.

[Al-Sayyid] The road to Madrid was long and arduous, and many obstacles had to be overcome for all the interested parties to be persuaded to come to the negotiating table. The main role in the organization of this forum was performed by the two great powers—the

Soviet Union and the United States—and also Egypt. It was quite difficult overcoming the resistance of certain circles in Israel, which believe that an attempt will be made at the conference to impose unacceptable solutions on this state.

Egypt considers the negotiations in Madrid a very important step en route to a just and lasting peace in the region. We also attach great significance to the fact that the Arab delegations have formulated the common principles of their policy and will operate as a single team, coordinating their actions. They want just one thing: fulfillment of the UN Security Council resolutions for observance of the rights of all interested parties. We also consider a promising aspect the fact that Israel has consented to the participation and is prepared to discuss the question of the rights of the Palestinians—this is reason for optimism and hope for solutions which provide for the security of all countries, Israel included.

[Mikhaylov] Mr. Ambassador, will attempts be made, in your opinion, to frustrate the work of the Madrid conference?

[Al-Sayyid] Undoubtedly. There have already been such and there will be more. Not only extreme rightwing circles of Israel but also the members of the government who cannot abandon the idea of the continued building of settlements on occupied territory and the ultimate annexation of Arab land cannot reconcile themselves to the Madrid forum. Nor will certain extremist Palestinian organizations, opponents of a dialogue with Israel, and groups of extremists in other Arab countries sit doing nothing.

But it seems to me that good will will conquer and that the process of a Near East settlement will develop successfully. I would like to call attention to the fact that the conference is supported by the most influential Arab countries and Palestinian organizations and that in Israel public opinion is increasingly disposed toward an understanding of the important fact that real security consists of the peaceful coexistence of all states of the region and cooperation. I understand full well that the conference will be difficult and that the negotiations will be long and arduous, but I believe in its success and am looking to Madrid with great optimism.

[Mikhaylov] You have spoken about the significant role which the USSR, the United States, and Egypt performed in the organization of the Madrid meeting. To what did it amount?

[Al-Sayyid] The Soviet Union and the United States are great powers enjoying tremendous influence and authority in the Near East. They have demonstrated the highest diplomatic assertiveness and have coordinated their actions for the achievement of the mutual understanding and convergence of the viewpoints of all the parties which will take part in the negotiations. It may be said that the USSR and the United States have employed all means without exception to ensure that the conference take place and prove a success.

As far as Egypt's role is concerned, I simply cannot agree with its evaluation as a mediating mission. Our country is part of the Arab world, and this says it all. We have succeeded in doing a great deal because we adhere to a quite moderate position and have normal diplomatic relations not only with all the Arab countries but also with Israel and have also reached complete mutual understanding with the USSR and the United States. I may say that Egypt has excellent relations with both great powers.

I would like to wish the Madrid meeting, which will be of tremendous significance for the whole world, success. I hope that a spirit of cooperation, mutual understanding and a sincere aspiration to resolve all problems only by the path of peace will reign both at the conference itself and around it. May the guns remain silent in the Near East forever!

Memorandum Signed With G-7 on Foreign Debt

OW2910153491 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1215 GMT 29 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Last night heads of government of 12 sovereign republics had a meeting in Moscow with deputy finance ministers from the G-7 at which they signed a memorandum on mutual understanding with regard to the payment of the USSR's foreign debt by the Soviet Union itself and its successors.

The memo was signed by 10 republics. Uzbekistan and Turkmenia will, according to Ivan Silayev, Chairman of the Interrepublican Economic Committee, do so today. Mr. Silayev said the document came into force from the moment it was signed.

It was originally envisaged that the memo should be signed by representatives from the three Baltic states as well, which was something Ukrainian Prime Minister Vitold Fokin insisted on, but there was some resistance to this during the negotiations, so that Mr. Fokin even left the room at one point as a sign of protest. Ultimately, however, it was decided that the Baltic states would not put their signatures to the document but the text would include a clause to the effect that separate negotiations would be held and an agreement concluded in accordance with which they would pay a share of the debt "jointly and severally."

In the memo the republics recognize their "joint responsibility for the payment of the debt and make a provision to the effect that the payments will be made via a single authorized establishment—the USSR Vneshekonombank [Foreign Economic Bank] or its successor. The signatories are planning to set up an international body to supervise the payment of the debt.

It is also envisaged that the republics which have signed the memo will work out a mechanism to deal with the foreign debt of the Soviet Union, for which purpose they will require information on the assets and liabilities of the USSR from relevant government bodies. The signatories guarantee that none of these steps will in any way hinder the immediate coming into force of the memorandum.

In an interview granted to IF [INTERFAX] Mr. Silayev said he was satisfied with the results of the meeting.

Joint Responsibility Confirmed

PM3010155091 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 30 Oct 91 Union Edition p 1

[Report by I. Demchenko: "We Will Pay Foreign Debts Jointly"]

[Text] After a meeting with G-7 deputy finance ministers, the signing of a memorandum guaranteeing the payment of the USSR's foreign debt began.

The memorandum acknowledges that the sovereign republics are responsible for the debts of the former USSR (the legal owner of the debt is the Union). This agreement means, among other things, that the participants in the talks on our side arrived at an understanding of the simple fact of the need to repay debts not only because of the desire to acquire new debts, but also because debts are supposed to be repaid. The memorandum also declares joint responsibility. This means that the inability of any republic to pay will be our internal affair and will not affect the creditors. Agreement was reached that payment will take place through the USSR Vneshekonombank [Bank for Foreign Economic Activity].

The attainment of these accords was also the result of the fact that the Western side has completed the process of studying the problem of clarifying particular details and figures. The facts about us are now recognized by G-7.

It was not easy to reach a consensus. We reported yesterday that some republics had come to the meeting with a special position. Georgia, in particular, was at first inclined to dissociate itself entirely from the USSR's international commitments. On several occasions Ukrainian Prime Minister V. Fokin was on the point of leaving the session for political reasons. The result achieved is therefore all the more valuable.

The G-7 representatives also displayed understanding. After the end of the session they stated that they had no more questions about the USSR's foreign debt. Moreover, they said that many aspects of internal relations among the former union republics had also been clarified. They reaffirmed the accord reached at the recent meeting in Bangkok: In the event that the USSR Vneshekonombank has a liquidity problem and needs urgent financial assistance, the G-7 countries will give such assistance.

The document drawn up by the republics together with the G-7 representatives is a real, practical step along the path of resolving our economic problems. It remains to be hoped that the process of signing it, which has begun successfully, will not be protracted. Today we publish the full text of the memorandum.

Unprofessional Behavior Noted

OW2910160391 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1500 GMT 29 Oct 91

["G7's Negotiators Find Partners in Ex-Soviet Republics Disappointingly Incompetent"—INTERFAX headline; transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] One of the Soviet participants in yesterday's Moscow conference vith the deputy finance ministers of the G7 has told IF [INTERFAX] that the guests were disappointed at the low professional level of their partners from ex-Soviet republics. He said he had been told as much during informal conversations vith members of the G7 delegation.

The Soviet specialist said most of the republics did not have high-class economists, which had made some of the Western delegates describe Monday's [28 October] conference as "crazy." Another irritating trend was that republican representatives had often dragged out the discussion by filling purely technical questions to the brim with politics, the Soviet participant complained.

After protracted and turbulent debates, during which the Ukrainian negotiator had even staged a protest walkout, the twelve republics undertook to bear joint responsibility for the USSR's external debt and assured the West that they would make debt payments via the USSR Foreign Economic Bank or its legal successor. A separate agreement on participation in the Soviet Union's debt servicing will be concluded with the three Baltic republics.

Meanhile, the Georgian President Zviad Gamsakhurdia has told a news conference in Tbilisi that his republic is supporting the Ukrainian demand that the memorandum on the USSR's foreign debt include a provision on a mechanism of payments and the division of the USSR gold reserve among the republics.

'Disorder', 'Vacillation' Reported

PM3010131791 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 29 Oct 91 Union Edition p 1

[Article by I. Zhagel: "G-7 Want To Know Who Will Pay Debts"]

[Text] The G-7 deputy finance ministers had a two-day meeting—27 and 28 October—in Moscow with the heads of government of 12 republics of the former Union, during which they discussed matters pertaining to the development of our foreign economic contacts and, in particular, the problem of payment of the foreign economic debt.

This problem is in fact crucial for our future relations with the West today. It is no coincidence that, according to a confidential report from one participant—journalists were not allowed into the meeting—Germany's representative said outright that the question of servicing credits will undoubtedly be directly linked to further financial and even food aid from the G-7 countries this winter. Our creditors expect 100-percent guarantees that the debt will be paid and corresponding agreements concluded within the country.

Unfortunately, the republics' representatives have not as yet displayed the corresponding understanding of the importance of formulating clear mechanisms for cooperation between the republics. They generally state their willingness to take responsibility for the Union's commitments, but as soon as talk turns to details and conditions for putting this idea into effect, disorder and vacillation set in. Once again, according to reports from the confidential source, the statement by one republic representative, who said that the arrival of the G-7 delegation is important in enabling the republics to begin formulating specific accords, sounded extremely awkward.

A strange statement. On the one hand, it once again illustrates that political considerations still prevail over the economy in our country and, on the other hand, it may have serious consequences in relations with our creditors and evoke in them a desire to wait on financial aid until the situation in our country finally becomes clear.

This disquiet manifested itself at the meeting. The G-7 representatives asked: You say that the republics will participate in paying off the foreign debt, yet why are they paying nothing into the Vneshekonombank [Bank for Foreign Economic Activity] today? This is effectively evidence that some people have not abandoned the idea of sharing out the Union's financial commitments. And Moldova's representatives even said outright that that is what they want to do. These actions can only cause the West to cool off on further cooperation and may even cause panic within the G-7 banking system.

However, the republics showed their failure to realize the full subtlety and complexity of financial cooperation with the West during the recent signing of the economic treaty. In particular, the section on the new Union's foreign activity says that the republics intend to create a new banking institute to be the heir of the USSR Vneshekonombank. This means that when the Vneshekonombank is wound up our creditors can, under international regulations, demand the immediate repayment of all our foreign debts and only then formalize their relations with the new banking structures.

Needless to say, it is a pity that the republics did not formulate any definite stance before meeting the G-7 representatives, which might have reassured the West. It is good that during the meeting itself a general position was achieved on questions of paying the foreign debt. It is to be formalized in a special memorandum in which the republics will once again confirm their commitment to the principle of "joint and several responsibility."

I can add that on the morning of 28 October the G-7 representatives met I. Silayev, chairman of the Interrepublic Economic Committee, who also confirmed that he would strive to get an agreement concluded between the republics, making provision for collective responsibility for meeting the former Union's financial commitments to the West.

United States & Canada

KGB Official Admits Past Ties With Clergy

OW3110125491 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1148 GMT 31 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Deputy Chairman of the Soviet KGB Nikolay Stolyarov has admitted the existence of close ties between the KGB and "a certain part of the clergy" as well as government structures dealing with religion, including the Council for Religious Affairs in the past. "Fortunately, all this is history now," he stressed.

Speaking in Moscow on Wednesday [30 October] at a meeting with leaders of U.S. Christian communities, he said that the main purpose of the KGB today is analytical work.

Stolyarov spoke of the determination of the KGB leadership to considerably reduce the staff and surrender part of the powers to appropriate services in the republics, as well as the wish to make it more open. According to Stolyarov, a public committee affiliated to it is expected to be set up which would involve well-known personalities. An invitation has been sent to USSR People's Deputy Yuriy Vlasov (one of the greatest critics of the KGB).

At the meeting Stolyarov expressed the hope that after reorganization, the KGB staff would consist of people of high moral principles, including believers, respecting the feelings, including religious feelings, of others.

The latest session of the Soviet State Council decided to set up three separate agencies on the basis of the KGB: the Foreign Intelligence Committee, the Inter-Republican Security Service and the Border Committee. These structural changes should be first approved by the national parliament.

Further on U.S. Defense Official's Visit

LD3010204591 Moscow TASS in English 1111 GMT 30 Oct 91

[By correspondent Roman Zadunaiskiy]

[Text] Moscow October 30 TASS—Cooperation in the military industry conversion were discussed here on

Tuesday [29 October] at a roundtable meeting between representatives of the Soviet and American military-industrial complexes.

Delegates of the General Motors, Boeing, and Ford companies had arrived in the Soviet Union among a delegation led by Donald Atwood, U.S. undersecretary of defence.

The time has come for the Soviet Union and the United States to jointly tackle conversion problems because disarmament processes in the two countries are of universal nature, Arkadiy Volskiy, deputy chairman of the committee on day-to-day economic management, who presided over the roundtable meeting, said in his remarks.

What is needed is a common and effective concept of a conversion mechanism and of conversion funding. The conversion process should not bear heavily on the working people, he pointed out.

According to data given by Volskiy, the Soviet military-industrial complex now includes about 2,500 defence plants, institutes and other organisations which employ 7.8 million people.

About half a million people will be laid off by the sector by the end of next year and the number of workers dismissed from the military-industrial complex may total two million, Volskiy said.

Atwood spoke about similar problems. At present military programmes in the United States have been cut down by 25 per cent and will be curtained still further, he said. It is planned to reduce the national armed forces from 2.4 million to 1.5 million men. The United States has already given up the production of 100 types of weapons, Atwood added.

The U.S. undersecretary of defence said the U.S. side is extremely interested in working out joint conversion programmes. Normal cooperation will be possible upon the development of a free enterprise system in the Soviet Union, he added.

Meets Lobov, Views Military Conversion

LD3010191891 Moscow TASS in English
1337 GMT 30 Oct 91

[By correspondent Oleg Moskovskiy]

[Text] Moscow October 30 TASS—"The conversion of military industries to meet civilian needs must be effected on principles of reciprocity," Chief of the Soviet General Staff Army General Vladimir Lobov told TASS after meeting First Deputy Defence Secretary of the United States Donald Atwood currently on a visit here.

"The conversion problems are not easy," the general believes, "since they are closely linked with the process of negotiations and disarmament, with the elaboration of the Soviet military doctrine and with the reform and reorganisation of the Soviet Armed Forces."

According to Lobov, the sides discussed the possibility of exchanging experience of organising the conversion in the Soviet Union and the United States and jointly seeking technological and other methods of switching over military industries to the output of peaceful goods.

"The sides," Lobov noted, "have agreed to arrange a visit by Soviet representatives to American enterprises slated for conversion, and to study the American experience." The visit is to take place shortly.

Northeast Asia

Foreign Ministry Issues Memo on Kurils

OW3010185291 Moscow INTERFAX in English
1715 GMT 30 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] IF [INTERFAX] learned that the Soviet Foreign Ministry's Pacific and Southeast Asia Department had sent a memo to the Sakhalin Governor Valentin Fyodorov on the Soviet-Japanese territorial problem.

The memo indicates that the Soviet side conducted negotiations with Japan's Foreign Minister Taro Nakayama in Moscow on October 12-16 from positions anchored in the Soviet-Japanese statement that had been passed last April following a visit to Japan by the Soviet C. [as received] As a result of the October negotiations, documents were signed by the Soviet and the Japanese foreign ministers on Japanese citizens visits to the islands Kunashiri, Etorofu, Shikotan and Habomai and of the residents of the islands to Japan without visas.

The Soviet Union declared plans to reduce its troops on the South Kuril islands by 30%. An agreement has been reached on the reorganisation of the operation of the Soviet Japanese working group on the peace treaty. A subgroup has been set up to discuss the territorial clause of the agreement. The subgroup is led by deputy chairman of the Russian Foreign Minister Georgiy Kunadze.

The memo says that the issue of transferring South Kurils to Japan was not discussed in Moscow.

The Soviet line at the peace talks is currently being finetuned by the Union and the Russian leaders and is conducted by agreed activities of the Union and the Russian Foreign Ministries, says the memo. The Russian Ministry adheres to a five-stage settlement plan that was suggested by Yeltsin in January 1991:

—the official recognition by the USSR of a territorial problem in Soviet-Japanese relations;

—the demilitarisation of the islands Kunashiri, Etorofu, Shikotan and Habomai;

—the proclamation of the islands a free economic zone with an easy regime, the conclusion of a treaty between Russia and Japan on the development of cooperation in trade, economy, science and technology;

—giving the islands the status of a free territory;

—the transfer of the islands to Japan.

Russian leaders are currently speaking in favour of a speedy implementation of Yeltsin's plan, says the memo. There are no differences between the centre and Russia on this.

ROK Paper Claims Weapons to DPRK Stopped

LD3110042591 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 1700 GMT 30 Oct 91

[Text] The ROK's CHUNGANG ILBO newspaper carries an interesting report saying that the Soviet Union has stopped supplying the DRPK with offensive weapons. The newspaper says that this is connected with the establishment of diplomatic relations between the USSR and the ROK and with the $3 billion in credits that Seoul has promised to our country. It is worth noting here that the DPRK has still not settled its account for deliveries of our weapons, and its overall debt to the USSR stands at almost $5 billion.

ROK Military Attache Interviewed

SK3110061891 Moscow Radio Moscow in Korean 1100 GMT 29 Oct 91

["Focus on Asia" interview with ROK military attache Choe Yang-ha by a KRAZNAYA ZVEZDA reporter; place and date not given]

[Text] (?A military attache's office) in charge of defense affairs was opened at the ROK Embassy in Moscow on 28 October.

Military attache Choe Yang-ha, ROK Army colonel, gave an interview to a KRAZNAYA ZVEZDA reporter.

Colonel Choe Yang-ha termed the opening of the military attache's office at the ROK Embassy in Moscow "an historical event."

The cold war has disappeared as a result of President Gorbachev's perestroyka. This, in turn, has opened the door to an effective development of economic, political, and cultural ties between the two countries. It is about time for the two countries to improve relations, even in the military area.

Contacts in the military area have already begun. For example, Lieutenant General Novozhilov, commander of the Far East Military District, is soon to visit the ROK at the invitation of a school.

General Yong Yong-il, a high-ranking ROK military leader in charge of a department at the Defense Affairs Ministry, is expected to visit the Soviet Union to attend the opening ceremony of the military attache's office.

Commenting on South-North relations, Col Choe Yang-ha expressed his conviction that constructive talks between the delegations of the South and North should be made to precede [words indistinct], and the United Nations offers a good opportunity for this.

Progress is being made in the talks, and I believe that a decisive breakthrough will be produced in the not too distant future, he said.

Touching on the issue of ensuring nuclear safeguards on the Korean peninsula, the military attache at the ROK Embassy in Moscow stated that no public figures have confirmed or denied the presence of nuclear weapons on the Korean peninsula. It has been unofficially confirmed, however, that U.S. troops stationed in the ROK are armed with tactical nuclear weapons.

President Bush's proposal for withdrawing tactical nuclear weapons, according to the ROK military attache, will have an impact on the development in the South-North talks.

Commenting on (North Korea's) plan to develop nuclear weapons on its own, he said: Nuclear development by North Korea, which is a possibility, should be shelved.

At any rate, North Korea is against international inspections of its nuclear facilities. The world does not want the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.

Even ROK citizens know well what it is to have nuclear weapons. Thousands of Korean people who were in Japan during World War II died when atomic bombs were dropped on Japanese cities and nearly 100,000 others still greatly suffer from the radiation they received at that time.

At the end of the interview, Col Choe Yang-ha, military attache at the ROK Embassy to the Soviet Union, expressed his conviction that the Soviet Union will find a way out of crisis in coordination with all its people. He said the ROK people have known all along that the Russian Empire, also known as the Soviet Union, is a great country.

More IZVESTIYA Reportage on KAL Tragedy

[92UF0088A Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 17 Oct 91 Union Edition p 6]

[Article by A. Illesh and A. Shalnev under the rubric "Mystery of the Korean Boeing-747": "Once Again About Rumors and Refrigerator-Trawlers"]

[Text] Many spaces still remain "blank" in the investigation of the South Korean passenger plane shot down over Sakhalin eight years ago. Articles published this year in IZVESTIYA were the first to lift the veil of secrecy drawn by the military and special services over that tragic story, but they did not exhaust the subject. An article appeared the other day (IZVESTIYA, No. 236) under the headline "Fishing Trawlers Deep-Freezing... Bodies?" The article informed us about the "bomb" that exploded in the Japanese press: Some information was published there claiming that the passengers who had died on that flight were picked up and their bodies frozen in refrigeration chambers of Sakhalin fishing trawlers. The association of victims' relatives demanded the bodies from the Soviet side... Where did this version of the incident come from? We asked this question and promised to supply some of the details of the case that remained unknown to our readers.

We have such an opportunity today. Valeriy Kulbakov, on an assignment from SOVETSKIY SAKHALIN, tried several times to get closer to a solution of the South Korean Boeing-747 crash mystery. He helped his colleagues from the Japanese YOMIURI to meet with some of the witnesses. We are publishing new details that we managed to learn from eyewitnesses of the tragedy. We hope to make it clear now where the "dead bodies in the refrigerator" came from...

Here is the story told by V. Anisimov, who was a captain-lieutenant in 1983 and commanding a border ship.

"At 0532 or 0533 (Sakhalin time, which 'runs' eight hours ahead of Moscow time) I suddenly saw the 'target.' It was rushing down at a speed of at least 800 kilometers an hour... About 40 seconds later the 'blip' split in two, then one more piece split off. Everything went dark. I outlined the area of the fall and made my report..."

Valeriy Nikolayevich is one of the few people who saw the crashing airliner on the screen of his onboard radar as it was falling to its destruction.

Ivan Ivanovich Biryuk, a captain from the Nevelsk trawling fleet base, is still convinced that he was the first to discover the Boeing impact site. This is how it happened.

"We were returning from an expedition. Our tuna-fishing super-seiner (SST) Uvarovsk was on course to Korsakov. On 1 September 1983, at about 0700, we were ordered to make a sharp turn and go to the site of the plane crash (we already knew it was a Boeing-747 from the 'Voice of America' broadcast). There was one spot there, right under a break in the clouds, where I noticed something that looked like emulsion. We came closer: Fuel was gushing from the deep sea and spreading into a wedge of about 200 meters. Various items were floating around... There was a slow drift to the south. It was about 1000 when I and my crew mates lost our last doubts that we really were at the crash site. I reported the position by radio to my base and marked it on the map. The response came very quickly: We were told to leave the area and continue on our own course; we were not involved in any further search operations."

What did he see then, in the morning of 1 September, on the surface of the Tatar strait? Many different things: There were plane seats, heaps of plastic trays that got fused together, jeans, shoes that for some reason were laced up to the top, sneakers, wallets, some papers, ID's, foreign paper money... In other words, all the things already mentioned by IZVESTIYA in its investigative articles. There were also pieces of the plane lining and chunks of broken seats. He remembers a woman's purse, its zipper pulled tight... A real fur coat, leather overcoats...

"We did not pick up anything from the surface," Biryuk insists.

"For some reason, almost all personal items remained intact. We have not seen anything like that before," emphasizes S. Sinelnikov, warrant officer from the border ship Zabaykalye on which I happened to sail to Moneron at the end of same 1983 and whose crew helped to pick up personal items and other things from the surface of the sea and load them on the trans-shipper.

Stop here! Here comes the confession that will bring us nearer to the truth.

"During the night of 2 September we saw parts of human bodies in the water that were lit up by our spotlights," remembers V. Alekseyev, Captain 3rd rank, who served then on the Zabaykalye. This sinister sight was also seen by warrant officer Yu. Tselyutin from the Zabaykalye.

Let us return now to Captain-Lieutenant V. Anisimov who saw the target on his radar screen. Later, as he arrived at the search area, he saw something else.

"Our ship entered the search area sometime in the afternoon on 1 September. We saw a lot of children's toys and other items on the water. Then (here comes a pause on the tape) I saw bits of flesh mixed in the water. I had studied at the medical institute, I knew anatomy and I understood that these were muscles, parts of abdomens, tendons... All the rest must have been pulverized when the Boeing hit the water or during the explosion. Such a meat chopper..."

That was what began the tale of the dead bodies picked up and preserved by the fishing refrigerator-trawlers!

We asked: Did they pick up the little that obviously was left of the people? The initial response was negative, but... We have to apologize to our readers for this bordering-on-naturalistic picture, but we cannot do without it. According to I. Biryuk, V. Anisimov told him in a private conversation that they did pick up some 100 kilos of human remains and handed them over to the trans-shipper that arrived at that time. Unfortunately, we failed to find any traces of that boat.

"Had the plane broken apart while still in air, then there would have been bodies, of course," Lieutenant-Colonel N. Puzan, who was serving in the fighter regiment in the village of Sokol at the same time as Gennadiy Osipovich took off from there in his fighter plane to intercept the South Korean airliner, shares his conclusions. "I also think that everything was blown to smithereens during the impact when the Boeing struck water. The bones were crushed into zillions of tiny 'needles'..."

An interview with M. Demchishin, head of deep-divers unit of the Far East exploratory drilling administration, (he took part in the sea bed search for the plane, an operation that was described in detail in the first IZVESTIYA articles on the subject) cites the following:

"Yes, our divers did see human remains on the sea bed. The larger ones would disintegrate the moment you touched them. Crabs and crayfish were sweeping the bottom traveling in three tiers. So there can be no doubts about whether there were any people on board the plane. Of course there were."

Near East & South Asia

Israeli Envoy on Palestinian Question

PM3110105591 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 30 Oct 91 p 3

[Interview with Israeli Charge d'Affaires Arye Levin by V. Afanasyev; date and place not stated: "The Long Road to Realism—An Interview With Israeli Charge d'Affaires in the USSR Arye Levin"]

[Text] With the establishment of diplomatic relations between the USSR and Israel came the opportunity to obtain first-hand clarification of the Israeli position on the Palestinian question, as we are wont to call it. Below is a conversation between our observer V. Afanasyev and Arye Levin, Israel's Charge d'Affaires in the USSR, who has been ambassador in Moscow by his country's government.

In the next edition we intend to publish an interview reflecting the views of the Palestinian State Embassy in Moscow on the very same question.

[Afanasyev] Mr. Levin, what proposals is the Israeli delegation taking to Madrid?

[Levin] Certain explanations are required here. This process began 15 May 1989 on the initiative of the Israeli side, which submitted four points for discussion. First, to establish complete peace in the Near East with the signing of peace treaties. Second, to resolve the problem of refugees in the Near East once and for all and within the framework of international cooperation, insofar as this question concerns not only Israel but also a whole range of countries. Since 1947, there has been a large flow of immigrants from Arab countries into our country and from Israel into Arab countries. This question must be resolved with due account taken of all sides' interests, bearing in mind that in years gone by many of the problems have in fact already been resolved. Third, it is necessary to establish extensive cooperation with all Near East countries for such vitally important issues as energy and water supply. Fourth, direct peace talks between us and the Arab countries should be held without interference from other countries and with due recognition of Israel as a sovereign, Jewish state in the Near East. At the same time, broad negotiations should be conducted on developing the whole region. Israel has submitted a plan for that, too, in the past. Our proposals were accepted by the United States and other countries. This also marked the start of what we now call the peace conference.

[Afanasyev] How do you intend to solve the Palestinian question?

[Levin] Talks will be held now with the Jordanian-Palestinian delegation. We would like to reach agreement on establishing autonomy within approximately five years in those regions we call Judaea and Samaria (the West Bank) and Gaza. After three years, talks aimed at a definitive solution to the problem will begin.

[Afanasyev] Israel is seen as an aggressor-state...

[Levin] Who thinks that?

[Afanasyev] The world community.

[Levin] No, the world community does not see us like that... The Soviet Union is an aggressor.

[Afanasyev] The Soviet Union? In what way?

[Levin] Because it incited Syria to declare war on us in 1967.

[Afanasyev] But wasn't it Israel that occupied the Arab territories? The world community does not recognize their seizure, Mr. Levin.

[Levin] You cannot speak for the world community. In fact, throughout all those years the Soviet Union looked at world problems, including the Near East, through the dogmatic prism of propaganda.

[Afanasyev] This is the first time I have talked to an Israeli diplomat, and I would like to understand your position Mr. Levin. Do you agree that UN Resolution...

[Levin] Like me, you recognize that it is a stupid resolution. The Soviet side has already called for its rescindment...

[Afanasyev] Which resolution are you thinking of?

[Levin] The 1975 Resolution, which equates Zionism with racism.

[Afanasyev] Our diplomats announced that the Soviet Union does not intent to "rescind" the UN General Assembly 10 November 1975 Resolution No. 3379, which states that "Zionism is a form of racism and race discrimination." I was told with regard to this resolution that "it has lost all validity for us." Obviously, this means that USSR policy will no longer be guided by this resolution. But so far it has not been rescinded.

[Levin] Please do not forget that in the infamous conditions of 1951, when the Korean war was in progress, the United Nations adopted a whole series of resolutions in respect of the Soviet Union. At that time your country was seen as the aggressor... If you want to understand something, there is no need to revert to these positions.

[Afanasyev] Is Israel going to give the Golan Heights back to Syria? You know, it is Syria's land—or do you believe that this land belongs to Israel? It is well known that up to now Israel has made no declaration on establishing its firm borders. Isn't this so?

[Levin] You are not quite right. This problem has to be approached as a whole. Indeed, for many years the Golan Heights belonged to Syria. It was from there that the Syrian Army fired on our populated areas below in the valley. This continued for around 20 years. Many of our people perished there. On more than one occasion we warned Syria, but they continued firing. The Golan Heights represent a dangerous foothold for an aggressor—and they will remain in our hands...

[Afanasyev] Nevertheless, why is your government unwilling to hold talks with the PLO, which is the recognized defender and legal representative of the Arab Palestinian people?

[Levin] Who recognizes that?

[Afanasyev] The United Nations and the Palestinians themselves.

[Levin] Who voted for it?

[Afanasyev] I know of public opinion polls carried out among Palestinians, notably on the Arab territories you occupy.

[Levin] I know nothing about any such polls. But we agree that those Palestinians living in Judaea and Samaria should be granted autonomy.

[Afanasyev] Autonomy will not satisfy the Palestinians. Undoubtedly, to achieve peace it will be necessary to find the kind of solutions that will satisfy you and them. Do you agree with this?

[Levin] We agree that there should be peace. It remains to be seen what they agree to... The Palestinians allegedly "elected" the PLO because that organization terrorized them. These terrorists want to forcibly impose their opinion on the Palestinians.

[Afanasyev] Almost every day there are reports from the occupied territories of the deaths of Palestinian children. They are tortured and imprisoned. The press reports how many children have died and how many are in Israeli prisons. Is it really democratic to kill children just because they throw rocks at soldiers?

[Levin] The Palestinians throw rocks at the instigation of PLO representatives. A civil war is going on among the Palestinians. It has been going on for a long time already. No doubt you know that in the last two years over 700 Arabs have been killed by Palestinians themselves. This greatly exceeds the number of Palestinians who have died in clashes with the Israeli Army. I am convinced that it is totally undemocratic and sinister to use children and teenagers in a political struggle.

[Afanasyev] Of course, they believe that these Palestinians are collaborators and cooperate with you, so they annihilate them too. Obviously, it is their business in general...

[Levin] It is their affair...

[Afanasyev] With regard to atomic weapons—does Israel have any or not?

[Levin] Israel has stated on several occasions that it will not be the first to use atomic weapons in our or any other region.

[Afanasyev] The U.S. magazine TIME reported in 1976 that Israel possessed atomic weapons and that during the 1973 October War it was prepared to use them against the Arabs. This is also mentioned in the recently published book by American journalist Seymour Hersh, *The Samson Option*.

[Levin] I do not set much store by what journalists write. It is all fabrication.

[Afanasyev] But Israel has not signed the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty. [Levin] No, we have not signed it. Nor have India or a whole series of other countries. I believe Israel has the right to think of its own defense.

[Afanasyev] Your government believes—and Prime Minister Yitzhaq Shamir has declared this on many occasions, as have other politicians and statesmen—that the PLO is a terrorist organization.

[Levin] Of course.

[Afanasyev] Why do you think the PLO is a terrorist organization?

[Levin] Because it carries out terrorist acts.

[Afanasyev] According to international law, people who have suffered occupation are permitted to conduct any kind of struggle against the occupiers, including armed struggle.

[Levin] We do not consider this occupation. We believe that these territories were occupied by us during defensive wars, and that we now have the right to control them until peace treaties are signed.

[Afanasyev] And what about East Jerusalem?

[Levin] The East Jerusalem question will not be discussed as it has already been solved.

Petrovskiy on Afghan POW's, UN Meetings

OW3010171391 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1619 GMT 30 Oct 91

["Diplomatic Panorama" feature by Mikhail Mayorov and Igor Porshnev; transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] USSR First Deputy-Foreign Minister, Vladimir Petrovskiy, told DP [Diplomatic Panorama] in an exclusive interviev that the USSR has raised the question of releasing not only Soviet, but also all other POWs captured in Afghanistan. He said that only when all prisoners on both sides return home, can one talk about the end of the war in Afghanistan.

Mr. Petrovskiy believes that the possible visit to Moscow of a mujahidin delegation, headed by the leader of the Islamic Society of Afghanistan, Burkhanuddin Rabbani, preliminarily scheduled for November, may play an important role only if the delegation shows readiness to tackle the problem of the POWs release. Mr. Petrovskiy said it was a matter of "moral and political duty."

Among the problems which Vladimir Petrovskiy has just discussed in New York with UN Secretary General, Perez de Cuellar, is assistance in the release of the POWs captured in Afghanistan. Mr. Petrovskiy said that Perez de Cuellar treated this humanitarian mission with deep understanding.

The U.S. also views the efforts to release all the prisoners captured in Afghanistan as a humanitarian problem, said Vladimir Petrovskiy. Moscow and Washington believe that these efforts should be made alongside the implementation of the Soviet-American agreements on the termination of arms supplies to all of the conflicting parties in Afghanistan.

Speaking about his meetings, talks and speeches in New York, the high-ranking Soviet diplomat said that they dealt with a wide range of problems which had to do with "the role of the UN in the emerging new world order." Vladimir Petrovskiy's mission was to present Moscow's position on disarmament in connection with George Bush's and Mikhail Gorbachev's initiatives and determine the role the UN could play in their implementation. Mr. Petrovskiy also set forth Soviet approaches to the ongoing reformation of the UN. Among the regional problems discussed was settlement in the Middle East, in El Salvador and in Afghanistan.

Impact of Policy Shift on Afghanistan Noted

92UF0125A Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 26 Oct 91 Union Edition p 5

[By IAN correspondent Andrey Pravov: "How To Untie the Afghan Knots?"]

[Text] Kabul—People in Kabul are uneasy. There has been a sharp increase in the number of rocket attacks on the city. Kabul International Airport is being hit most. Aleksandr Vasilenko, general Aeroflot representative in Afghanistan, says that hardly a single flight is without incident. Last week an Il-76 was taken back to Tashkent several times while on its approach to Kabul. The runway came under attack. Vasilenko showed me a crater made by a missile that exploded several dozen yards from the airport building. The explosion occurred just at the time when an airliner of the Afghan Ariana Airline was making a landing. There were no casualties, fortunately.

"We are making our own efforts," Vasilenko said, "to try and do everything to ensure that Aeroflot flights are as safe as possible. I would not want to disclose our actions, but everything is operating efficiently as yet...."

The missiles are also hitting the city daily, indiscriminate in their choice of victims. The hospitals are full to overflowing with people who have been maimed. There are many children among them. Local television recently showed scenes from the Indira Gandhi Children's Hospital. Appalling scenes....

People's nerves are stretched to the limit. The growing difficulties involving power supplies are contributing to this also. Kabul inhabitants' homes are sometimes without power for days on end. Armed opposition detachments operating in the vicinity of the Naghlu Hydroelectric Power Station are blowing up the power line supports, and there is barely sufficient capacity at the heat and electric power plant in the city itself, in the Heirhan district, for industrial facilities.

One further unpleasant factor acting powerfully on the nerves is the sharp increase in prices. And inflation is already making virtually all basic necessities—flour, rice, fat, gas oil, and firewood for heating the home—unobtainable for the residents of Kabul. The exchange rate of the dollar on the local market has risen to 1,200 afghanis: civil servants' wages average 4,000-5,000 afghanis a month. Merchants are asking more than 1,000 afghanis for a liter of gasoline. There are long lines at the state bus filling stations.

The inhabitants of Kabul link all the present difficulties, of course, not only with the war but also with the grim economic situation in the USSR, which has for the past 13 years been Afghanistan's main supplier of food and fuel. Naturally, the "northern neighbor," as the Soviet Union is called here, is not now in a position to continue to render Afghanistan assistance free of charge, even in far more modest amounts than previously.

But interstate agreements already signed should be fulfilled. USSR Ambassador B.N. Pastukhov spoke about this, among other things, at a meeting with journalists in Kabul. He pointed out that before the year's end the Soviet Union intends supplying Afghanistan with approximately 60,000 tons of gasoline, 100,000 tons of diesel fuel, 40,000 tons of aircraft kerosene, and 10,000 tons of lamp oil. The ambassador said also that vigorous actions are being taken in the search for mutually profitable contracts between the Afghan side and Soviet republics, oblasts, and cities. Thus an agreement on the supply of 50,000 tons of wheat from Kazakhstan was signed recently. In exchange this republic will receive 3,000 tons of choice Indian tea, which is not an item in short supply on the Afghan market.

It is clear today that in the economic sphere Afghanistan must count more on self-reliance and not expect anyone to feed its population free of charge. This is fully understood here. The Ministry of Trade is drawing up a plan of mutually profitable deals, with the USSR included. The local private sector is capable of providing the Soviet market with such commodities as furs, leather goods, vegetables, fruit, and meat, primarily mutton. One tradesman told me that negotiations are currently under way with various countries, primarily India, on supplies of wheat to Afghanistan. The economic crisis in the country will, possibly, soon be overcome, and the curve of inflation will head downward.

The end to Soviet arms supplies scheduled for 1 January next year is far more troubling to some Afghans here. And not only those who support the Najibollah regime or who are at least loyal to it are worried. The announced Soviet-U.S. moratorium is giving rise to unhappiness in many people. It cannot, after all, guarantee a complete termination of military supplies to Afghanistan. Neither Pakistan nor Saudi Arabia, who are important arms suppliers to the mujahidin, have yet subscribed to the moratorium. Consequently, the opposed parties could end up in an unequal position. In the present situation, this is dangerous.

"I have always been opposed to the Najibollah regime," an Afghan professor who asked that I not give his name told me. "But in this case his departure from the political scene, whether voluntary or brought about by military defeat, would mean that power would end up in the hands of extremist opposition circles, that is, fundamentalists. For me personally, Hikmatyar is more frightening than Najibollah. In my view, the mujahidin must not gain any military advantage...."

My partner's opinion is based on serious arguments. Only the armed formations of the extremists represent a real military force among the opposition. According to reliable data, Hikmatyar's squads number up to 50,000 fighters. There are approximately 14,000 fighters in Khalis' detachments. As far, however, as the so-called "moderates" are concerned, these figures appear far more modest.

What is the solution to this situation? How can peace be brought to Afghanistan with account being taken here of the interests of both the Afghans themselves and all the forces involved in the protracted conflict? In the opinion of many observers, the sole reasonable path is a ceasefire and the organization of free elections in the country.

Sub-Saharan Africa

Liberian Patriotic Front Releases Fishermen

OW2910181791 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1710 GMT 29 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] As IF [INTERFAX] learned from the Soviet Embassy in Cote d'Ivoire, on Tuesday, October 29th, at Gbe-Nda on the border with Liberia the Liberian National Patriotic Front set free and transferred to the Soviet Embassy in Cote d'Ivoire 14 Soviet fishermen captured from the boat "Bakurus". All of them feel well.

Foreign Ministry on Release

LD3010121991 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1927 GMT 29 Oct 91

[Text] Moscow, 29 Oct (TASS)—All 14 Soviet fishermen seized in Liberia and held in that country for over a month were today taken to the neighboring republic of Cote d'Ivoire and, with the help of the USSR Embassy in that country, are being sent to the town of Abidjan. This preliminary announcement was made by a USSR Foreign Ministry spokesman.

Great help in securing the release of the Soviet citizens has been given by the governments of the United States and Cote d'Ivoire, as well as by several other states.

East Europe

Serbian Delegation 'Disappointed' With Visit

LD3010224591 Moscow TASS in English 2232 GMT 30 Oct 91

[By correspondent Aleksandr Kondrashev]

[Text] A delegation from the Serbian Renovation Movement is disappointed with their Moscow visit.

During a news conference at the Belgrade Airport, leader of this major Serbian Opposition Party Vuk Draskovic said they will have to give up illusions that today's Russia can help Serbia.

During meetings in Moscow, Draskovic felt they feared that the military "fire" in Yugoslavia can spread to the already turbulent line between the Russian Federation and the Ukraine.

In Moscow Draskovic met Russian Vice-President Alekander Rutskoy, Chairman of the Russian Supreme Soviet Ruslan Khasbulatov, and Eduard Shevardnadze.

At the same time, Draskovic positively assessed determined and wise steps of the Russian leadership, which, in his opinion, contrast with actions of the Serbian leadership. He especially praised Yeltsin's intentions to create the Russian Guard, and, possibly, the Russian Army.

Official Cables SFRY on Missing Journalists

LD3010215191 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1900 GMT 30 Oct 91

[From the "TV Inform" newscast]

[Text] USSR Procurator General Nikolay Trubin has sent a telegram to Yugoslavia's federal procurator. It contains a proposal that qualified operatives of the USSR Procuacy and Ministry of Internal Affairs be sent to Yugoslavia to step up the search for the Soviet television journalists Viktor Nogin and Gennadiy Kurennoy.

West Europe

Gorbachev, Mitterrand Hold Talks in France

Agenda for Talks Reported

LD3010172991 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1600 GMT 30 Oct 91

[Excerpts] USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev left Madrid today for France. [passage omitted]

In France Mikhail Gorbachev will meet with President Francois Mitterrand for a private talk. Thereafter they will give a joint interview to the French television company Antenne-2. Tomorrow morning, 31 October, they will have a business meeting and the presidents will also give a joint news conference. It is expected that they will discuss questions of a Near East settlement, nuclear disarmament, and bilateral relations, in particular economic assistance to the USSR.

Talks Begin

LD3010184391 Moscow TASS in English 1830 GMT 30 Oct 91

[Text] Latche October 30 TASS—Talks have begun this evening between Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev and President Francois Mitterrand of France in Latche, the French president's private estate in southwest France.

French TV Interviews Presidents

LD3010224291 Moscow TASS in English 2223 GMT 30 Oct 91

[Text] Latche October 30 TASS—President Francois Mitterrand of France in an interview with the television network Antenne-2 on Wednesday [30 October] reiterated France's solidarity with the Soviet Union.

Mitterrand met Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev at his home in Latche to discuss specific projects of Soviet-French cooperation. He confirmed France will continue aid to the Soviet Union.

Speaking on the situation in the Soviet Union, Mitterrand stressed the need for a democratic federative Soviet Union.

Asked if he is still a communist, Gorbachev told the network "I have always remembered about millions of party members—honest people, convinced Communists. After the putsch, which was a personal drama for me, I could no longer stay in this structure of the old totalitarian power. But I am against anti-communism, as well, I'm against a 'witch hunt' and support democratic processes and spiritual freedom".

Speaking about his vision of European and world security, Mitterrand urged the Soviet Union to preserve the single armed forces command, especially of nuclear weapons.

"We are looking for new forms of life, moving from totalitarianism towards democracy. We are discussing the role of republics and various structures, including the army. Different opinions exist, but no final decisions have been made. However, the republics have agreed to have single armed forces and an economic space and pursue coordinated foreign policies. Today, the country's armed forces are under the single command," Gorbachev said.

Gorbachev on Relations With Yeltsin

LD3110083291 Moscow TASS in English 0750 GMT 31 Oct 91

[By correspondents Sergey Batyrev, Aleksandr Krivykh, and Yuriy Lopatin]

[Text] Soustons (southwestern France) October 31 TASS—The meeting between Francois Mitterrand and Mikhail Gorbachev in Latche is going on successfully in a cordial and frank atmosphere, said Jean Musitelli, a spokesman for the French president. He said Wednesday [30 October] evening talks were mostly dedicated to the Madrid peace conference on the Middle East. He added Gorbachev informed Mitterrand of his talks with the U.S. President George Bush, Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhaq Shamir and the Spanish Prime Minister Felipe Gonzalez.

The situation in the Soviet Union was also discussed, the prospects for signing a treaty on united economic area with the former Soviet republics, such as the Ukraine, for example. Gorbachev stressed the Ukraine will probably sign the treaty. Western aid to the Soviet Union was discussed as well. According to Musitelli, Gorbachev touched upon his relations with Boris Yeltsin. Gorbachev said there are forces trying to antagonise the two men but that doesn't affect their desire to cooperate.

Mitterrand spoke of European perspective and of creating political, economic, and financial unity within Europe. He emphasised the Soviet Union must become a member of the European "confederation", an idea originally put forward by the French leader.

Importance of Visit Noted

LD3010211991 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1900 GMT 30 Oct 91

["TV Inform" newscast from Biarritz by correspondent S. Iyezuitov]

[Excerpt] The day before this visit, LE MONDE carried the following cartoon: Gorbachev, visiting Mitterrand, says, "Now for a little rest after the coup!", and Mitterrand asks, "Coup? What coup?" The French still cannot forget that Mitterrand was rather slow to support the Soviet president and condemn the plotters. To all appearances, however, this has not affected relations between the two state figures, who met at Biarritz airport. President Mitterrand and his wife came here to welcome Mikhail Gorbachev.

This visit is very important for the Soviet president, it is being noted in France, because in a situation where the collapse of our country is continuing, it is necessary to show the republics and their political leaders that it is the center and the president who must represent the country in the international arena.

During the talks, Mikhail Gorbachev will tell President Mitterrand about the work of the Madrid conference and his meeting with George Bush. The talks are taking place at Latche, a private property of the French president, hidden away in the forests in the southwest of the country. In addition to the issues of European security in the light of the changes going on in our country, they will also deal with the provision of aid to the Soviet Union.

Undoubtedly, the parties will also touch on the subject of the Soviet nuclear arsenals. An agreement on nuclear disarmament is one thing, but it is quite another to put it into practice. The best way to prevent the gradual spread of control over nuclear weapons is to destroy them, but this requires enormous resources and a great deal of technology—and those are things Moscow does not have, in the opinion of local observers. Cooperation among the four nuclear powers on the continent of Europe could play an extremely important part in this regard. [passage omitted]

Gorbachev Departs for Moscow

LD3110115791 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1147 GMT 31 Oct 91

[Text] Biarritz, S.W. France 31 Oct (TASS)—USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev today left France for Moscow. He was seen off at Biarritz Airport by President Francois Mitterrand of France.

Barannikov Predicts 5 Million Emigrants

LD3010183791 Berlin ADN in German 1727 GMT 30 Oct 91

[Text] Berlin (ADN)—Up to 5 million Soviet citizens will leave for Western countries in the coming year. USSR Interior Minister Viktor Barannikov made this prediction to journalists in Berlin today. However, the quicker the success in consolidating the economy in the republics, the quicker the processes of migration can be halted. The politician reckons another 7 million Soviet citizens will leave the country as tourists in 1992.

Barannikov, who is participating in the ministerial conference on illegal immigration from and via Central and Eastern Europe at the Reichstag in Berlin, called on Western states not to restrict immigration to their countries. Such a move promotes illegal immigration. Regulatory inter-governmental treaties are necessary to manage the process of migration. The Berlin conference could make an important contribution to this. The USSR, which passed a law on free travel for the first time in 1991, intends to create an authority for immigration and emigration to this end.

Germans Intercept Tanks Destined for Israel

PM3110100291 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 30 Oct 91 Union Edition p 5

[By S. Guk under the rubric "We Report the Details": "Tanks Marked 'Made in the USSR' Nearly Set Sail for Tel Aviv: But This Time the Exporters Were Not Us, but BND, the German Intelligence Service"]

[Text] The affair was exposed by pure chance: The Hamburg police, during a routine procedure to check export goods, acted strictly according to instructions. The result: a catch. On the container ship Palma II, there was a discrepancy between the documents and the freight. Instead of the indicated "agricultural machinery" in the hold were 14 Soviet-made tanks and other military equipment from the arsenals of the former GDR National People's Army. The address of the recipient was Israel, and the dispatcher was the Federal Intelligence Service (BND), which had attempted to use an FRG transport firm as cover.

Deputy government spokesman Norbert Schaefer, as is customary, declared that official Bonn knew nothing at all about the planned deal. The tanks were being dispatched at the request of the Israeli intelligence service Mosad for tests on their military-technical characteristics. Tanks just like these are in the armory of Israel's neighbors. In fact, Schaefer added, it is quite normal for intelligence services to provide one another with such services from time to time.

The FRG general prosecutor's office does not agree at all with this view and has begun an investigation. Official Bonn's argument—that there was no question of the kind of potential with which Israel would be able to commence offensive operations—left the representatives of the law unimpressed. The prosecutor's office stated that all exports of military equipment require permission, and the law on controlling arms exports says nothing about making exceptions for the BND. The violation of this legislation carries a penalty of up to five years' imprisonment.

The leadership of the federal intelligence service now faces an unpleasant procedure of interrogations at the prosecutor's office.

For information: The BND was formed almost immediately after the war with the help of similar U.S. services. It has 7,000 staffers and is directly subordinate to the department of the federal chancellor. Its task is the collection and analysis of information (military, economic, political) outside the country, not inside. A parliamentary commission supervises the BND's activity, or rather, tries to. According to A. Emmerlich, one of its leaders, real oversight is virtually impossible, since the commission only has access to those materials that the BND leadership itself decides to submit to the deputies.

Ambassador to Sweden Departs Post

PM3010151191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 29 Oct 91 Union Edition p 4

[By correspondent M. Zubko: "Ambassador Quits Post"]

[Text] Stockholm—Our newspaper's readers (see IZVESTIYA No. 249) are asking: What was the upshot of the saga of ambassadors summoned to Moscow for consultations because of the stance they took during the coup? Because I am in Stockholm, I cannot say anything about the entire group of diplomats, but I am prepared to divulge some information about one of them.

It concerns Soviet Ambassador to Sweden N. Uspenskiy. Last Friday [25 October] he returned to Moscow after bidding Stockholm a final farewell. I think that we can now speak of him as our former representative in this Scandinavian country. But his departure was not as simple as it might have appeared.

It is well known that Soviet Foreign Minister B. Pankin said at a news conference in Stockholm 18 September, while on a stopover en route to New York, that the ambassadors in question were told to draw their own conclusions about the possibility of their carrying on in view of the reaction to their actions in the countries to which they are accredited.

The hint was more than transparent. It is easy to understand that the ambassadors were themselves told to resign. But N. Uspenskiy obviously decided otherwise. On his return to Stockholm after the consultations, the ambassador told the Swedish press that he had no intention of quitting his post because "he had received no instructions to return home." But it can be assumed that a couple of weeks later he finally received these instructions, and leading Swedish newspapers announced in harmony: "N. Uspenskiy is withdrawing as ambassador."

Reminding people that B. Pankin gave the ambassadors the choice of "how to go," the influential SYDSVENSKA DAGBLADET noted: "Uspenskiy could have left Stockholm voluntarily and thus expected to receive a good international job, or he could have waited to be forced to move to an inconspicuous post in the Foreign Ministry. Uspenskiy chose the latter."

Latin America & Caribbean

Work on Cuban Nuclear Power Plant May Stop

OW3010171691 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1619 GMT 30 Oct 91

["Diplomatic Panorama" feature by Mikhail Mayorov and Igor Porshnev; transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The construction of the Cuban nuclear power plant in Juragua, near Cienfuegos, proceeds behind schedule. Next year, the work on this major Soviet-Cuban project may be paralysed completely. The USSR Ministry of Foreign Economic relations confirmed in an interviev to DP [Diplomatic Panorama] that besides problems in supplying and assembling two nuclear reactors, a serious problem has arisen in handling the automatic control system.

As the construction of such projects has been put on a credit basis, next year the construction may come to a halt in the absence of financial resources. It is difficult to say who will hold talks with the Cuban side on the problem and whether the talks will be held at all.

It looks like the final decision on the future of the project will be taken by the Russian Federation which is responsible for at least 70 per cent of the supplies and workload. However, one can hardly expect the construction to be continued not only for economic, but also for political reasons. The talks held in Moscow by the leaders of the Cuban opposition Jorge Maz Canoza and Carlos Alberto Montaner, showed that the democratic-minded leaders of the Russian Federation intend to terminate assistance to Cuba altogether.

The U.S., concerned about the danger of the Chernobyl tragedy repeating itself near its borders, will obviously welcome the termination of the construction, while Cuba will become still more dependent on Soviet oil supplies, whose volume tends to decrease.

Political & Social

New Presidential Communication Center Set Up

LD3110084191 Moscow TASS in English 0827 GMT 31 Oct 91

[By TASS special correspondent Sergey Zinchuk]

[Text] Moscow October 31 TASS—A new scientific and technical computer center "Sistema" (The System) is now in operation, aiming to provide immediate and reliable information for the Soviet president's apparatus and communicate directly with various regions of the country, as well as with capitals of other states.

The new computer networks will soon enable President Mikhail Gorbachev to contact leaders of other states not only by telephone but directly through the computer displays.

Boris Tolstykh, former deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, who also headed the State Committee for Science and Technology and the State Committee for Computing Machinery and Informatics, has been appointed chief of the "Sistema" center.

"Rechner und Peripherie Vertriebs Gmbh" of Germany supplied the hardware for the center and "Software Agtransnational" company arranged the software.

"Creation of the 'Sistema' center is a vivid example of international collaboration. So, the design and the control system of the center was worked out by Soviet specialists, the office fitting was done by an Italian company, the computers were provided by our company and the software—by 'Software AG' company", Gerd Lutz, head of the hardware firm told TASS.

"As a result of joint international efforts we have managed to create an ultra modern computer center which can compete in efficiency with any similar computer network in the world", Gerd Lutz pointed out.

Committee for Operational Management Meets

Apprehensions Dispelled

LD3010191291 Moscow TASS in English 1340 GMT 30 Oct 91

[By TASS correspondent Ivan Ivanov]

[Text] Moscow October 30 TASS—"Only eleven people preferred to remain in the West out of the 2,270 specialists sent abroad for study by the USSR scientific and industrial union," Deputy Chairman of the Committee for the Operational Management of the country's National Economy Arkadiy Volskiy said today. "In the meantime, more than 200 former Soviet emigres have returned to the country and gone into business here," he noted.

This dispels the apprehensions, voiced at today's meeting of the committee, that the national programme for the economic education of young specialists abroad may suffer a fiasco, since many of them may prefer not to return home.

Today's meeting of the committee, devoted to problems of promoting business in the country, may prove to be the last one. Having succeeded the USSR Cabinet of Ministers two months ago, the committee has not adopted a single major decision since then. It is to discuss on Friday, November 1st, the structure and status of the new Union government—the Inter-state Economic Committee, which is being set up in keeping with the Economic Community Treaty, signed by eight republics.

Call for Support of Entrepreneurship

OW3010161891 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1500 GMT 30 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The Committee for Operative Economic Management held a session on Wednesday [30 October]. It called for including an interrepublican committee of support for entrepreneurship in the structure of the Interrepublican Economic Committee (IEC) that is being formed now. Its functions and powers will be determined following the session to be held on November 4 by the State Council which is to approve the structure of the IEC and its chairman, Ivan Silayev.

During the session it was suggested that I. Silayev should also lead the Council of the Prime Ministers of Sovereign Republics the IEC will be subordinate to. I. Silayev said that the republics should name the candidates.

The Committee for Operative Management approved a contract for the purchase of 0.5 million tons [as received] of fodder grain from Hungary. The session was told that no problems are expected to arise this winter in connection vith grain for human consumption. However difficulties might emerge as early as in February in the production of mixed feed from fodder grain.

The session was told that the Interrepublican Agreement on Food Products provides for buying 49.7 million tons of grain, out of which 36 million tons are to arrive under credits from foreign governments and the rest under commercial loans.

Coup Investigation To Conclude in Nov

OW3010184391 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1715 GMT 30 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] In recent weeks the arrested members of the emergency committee have been using the tactic of incriminating one another and their colleagues who are at large, said to IF [INTERFAX] one well-placed member of the team of investigators of the Soviet and Russian Procurator's Offices who requested anonymity because the Russian Procurator General had banned any interviews.

The investigator claimed that the investigation would probably be completed by late Nowember. Following that, cases will be brought against lower-rank Emergency Committee members.

Asked about the inquiry into the Foros developments, he emphasized that in November participants in the anti-president blockade would be interrogated again as they "had held back some of the facts and this is hampering the investigation."

The investigator did not rule out the possibility that following the investigation, the Soviet C Gorbachev [as received] will be reclassified as the aggrieved party. In this case, his testimony cannot be used in court.

Analysis Shows Majority Sided With SCSE

LD3010203691 Moscow TASS in English
1038 GMT 30 Oct 91

[Text] Moscow October 30 TASS—"Are the CPSU 'suspects' prepared to prove their alibis during the hearings in the Russian Supreme Soviet?" the newspaper "RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA" inquires today.

"According to the analysis, carried out by the control department of the Russian president's administration, more than 70 per cent of the regions, territories, autonomous republics and districts did not support the Russian leadership during the August events. They sided overtly or covertly with the State of Emergency Committee [SCSE]. Some of them preferred to wait-and-see or not to disclose their real stand," Valeriy Kachurin writes in the newspaper.

"The democratic forces in regional Councils of People's Deputies were actually in the minority. The share of former Party officials, incorporated into local executive bodies, ranged from 30 to 90 per cent throughout Russia," Kachurin notes.

"The Russian parliament was faced with many quite unexpected exposures and saw various secret cables, heard many guesses and suppositions during the hearings. But one thing is clear: the deputies can only presume, while it is for the court to pass the final verdict. It has the right to determine both the fate of the Soviet Communist Party and the personal responsibility that should be borne by its leaders. Only the court can decide whether this party has the right to exist or not," Kachurin believes.

Parties Termed CPSU Rightful 'Heirs'

Congresses on 26, 27 Oct

PM3010141191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
29 Oct 91 Union Edition p 2

[Article by I. Prelovskaya: "Number of CPSU Heirs Rises"]

[Text] Political streams that have already formed or are in the process of forming new parties have broken away—and are still doing so—from the former CPSU, which is now evidently receding into oblivion, and are changing their name, course, and program.

This process, which first emerged before the 28th CPSU Congress, when it became clear that there were already various ideological movements under the umbrella of the outwardly monolithic structure, is now reaching its logical conclusion following the Russian president's decree suspending the CPSU.

Two events in which Communists took an active part were held simultaneously in Moscow last Saturday and Sunday [26 and 27 October]: The first congress of the Democratic Party of Communists of Russia, which will henceforth be called the People's Party of Free Russia, was held in Cinematography Center, and the constituent conference of the Party of Socialist Left-Wing Forces was held at the "Kompressor" Plant's Palace of Culture.

The People's Party of Free Russia assembled for its congress having completed its organizational period, hence the bulky package of documents that were considered by approximately 600 delegates representing more than 60 regional branches. The new party, the declaration of principles says, recognizes no social group as the vanguard and represents the interests of everyone who favors equality and democratic forms of cooperation between social forces. Its aim is not to create a new society on any ideological model but to resolve specific issues raised by life. For that reason a party member can have any world outlook so long as it does not conflict with the ideas of freedom, justice, and solidarity among people. It sees the way to prosperity in a social market economy, the way to spiritual wealth in all-out support for the intelligentsia as the main force behind Russia's revival, and the way to political freedom in asserting the rights of the individual above all other sovereignties. The tasks that the party sets in its minimum program are as follows: The lifting of all restrictions on the increase in citizens' legal income and their economic initiative, rapid privatization of small enterprises, enactment of a minimum wage limit at the level of the living wage, a state employment program, military reform with switch to a professional army, and the overcoming of the paralysis of power by electing local self-management organs and the Russian parliament on a multiparty basis. In the elections the party will fight for seats in organs of power, manifest legislative initiative, and nominate political leaders. Free Russia intends to back the Russian

Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] president in his policy of radical socioeconomic reforms.

Russian Vice President A. Rutskoy was elected the party's chairman and social scientist V. Lipitskiy was elected chairman of its board. With regard to CPSU property, the party has decided to regard itself as the CPSU's rightful heir, opposing the premature acquisition of this property by local organs of power. The new party is prepared to take charge of that property which is deemed to belong to the CPSU, using it directly to meet working people's needs.

Shortly before the constituent conference of the party of left-wing forces, Gennadiy Sklyar, first secretary of Obninsk CPSU city party committee and City Soviet deputy, came to our editorial office. He is one of the authors of a statement by an action group comprising USSR and RSFSR People's Deputies A. Denisov, R. Medvedev, and I. Rybkin, Cosmonaut V. Sevastyanov, and others, advocating that this party be set up. Sklyar said that the Obninsk CPSU Gorkom Bureau dissociated itself from the State Committee for the State of Emergency 19 August, and the next day communist deputies voted at a session of the City Soviet in favor of totally backing the Russian president's actions. Sklyar is one of those young people who entered party work with a desire to reform society and the party. He was prompted to call on us by the commentary "Is There Such a Party?" "I understand the mistrust of our initiative," he said. "Too often in the past noble declarations conflicted with actions. Yet there is no point in rushing our assessments." According to Sklyar, the statement's authors encountered, on the one hand, accusations of betrayal and dissatisfaction by people who until recently were prominent apparatchiks and, on the other hand, suspicions that they themselves are only implementing tactics prescribed by the party apparatus. However, he was impelled to act by the conviction that society will derive more benefit if reformist forces within the party become more active; plenty of Communists are, after all, waiting to see what will happen, while the party orthodox are ready to attack, exploiting the crisis situation.

There were people with divergent views among the 300 or so delegates from Russia's 68 republics, krays, and oblasts and 100 guests.

We must not be ashamed of CPSU membership, the organizers said, but we do not want to restore it. Without renouncing the communist idea that "free development for the individual means free development for all," a transformed party can under present conditions feasibly aim merely to move toward socialism, asserting people's power and social justice and fighting for people's well-being.

The intention is to enable the new party to unite employees engaged in mental and physical labor as well as independent private producers. Leaving the final decision to the congress, the conference agreed to name the organization the Socialist Party of Working People. Meanwhile, prior to the congress, the organizational committee must prepare everything necessary to register the party. The party orthodox from the Communist Initiative Movement and Viktor Tyulkin left the conference. They intend to form an autonomous organization. Representatives of the Marxist Platform, some of whom also left the conference, also remained of a separate opinion. Communists will obviously remain divided in their views and streams, and the quest for new unifying ideas will evidently continue. Incidentally, the Socialist Party of Working People's draft statutes make provision for the existence of various factions and platforms within this party. The Socialist Party of Working People also intends to regard itself as one of the heirs of the CPSU. Who else intends to claim the legacy? It seems that the number of contenders may increase.

Party Holds Founding Conference

PM3010094091 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 29 Oct 91 p 2

[Report by A. Frolov under the rubric "Parties and Movements": "Gathered Here Because of Concern for the People's Fate"]

[Text] The initiative of the 12 political figures who recently issued an appeal for the formation of a party of left-wing forces of socialist orientation (see SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA for 2 October) was followed quite quickly by real developments. On 26 October, in Moscow, at the "Kompressor" plant's Cultural Institute, there was a meeting of 324 delegates with voting entitlements, who were given their powers by local initiative groups from 68 republics, krays, and oblasts of the Russian Federation. Among them were 25 USSR and RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] people's deputies.

Opening the founding conference of the new party, USSR People's Deputy R. Medvedev said:

"We are all gathered here because of our shared concern and sorrow—sorrow for our great country, for its people, for the working people whose life gets worse and worse and who are increasingly often left defenseless in the face of poverty, lawlessness, and the flouting of their rights.

"We all condemned the August attempted coup, but we must recognize that the political forces that have since come to power in Russia are largely forces whose main aim is by no means the defense of working people's interests. We can see that this was also unfortunately not the aim of the former CPSU leadership, from the days of Stalin and Brezhnev onwards, and that this aim, as recent events have shown, was also not the main aim for many leading figures in perestroyka.

"Therefore, although we regard the suspension of the CPSU's activity as unlawful and the proposed ban as disgraceful, we do not seek to revive the party in its previous form. We have no reason to be ashamed of our membership of the CPSU, but all the same, we are here for a different reason—to create a new party. We seek to create this party from below, drawing on the party masses and primary party organizations. We want to create a party with new program principles and new statutes. A party that would set itself the task of the protection of the working people, society's economic development, and the restoration of the peoples' friendship, which has been wrecked in many regions. A party that will fight for the ideals of socialism. That is why we propose to call it the Socialist Party of Working People."

The initiators of the conference repeatedly stressed during the proceedings that it was not convened in order to engage in theoretical disputes and proclaim a detailed program, but in order to found a party and adopt a statement in the most general terms, recording its socialist orientation. This is necessary in order speedily to launch work in the localities to set up regional organizations and prepare for the first party congress. But differences must be set aside until the congress, at which it will be possible to formalize these differences in the shape of factions, platforms, and currents within a single party.

Heated polemics flared up at the conference several times on questions relating to the program. Of course, this was due to the delegates' very natural "political impatience," but also, not least, to the fact that the initiative group, which, incidentally, formed the entire presidium at the conference, proposed very clear and specific ideological boundaries for the future association and firmly opposed all attempts during the conference to move those boundaries in one direction or the other, showing great skill acquired in experience of parliamentary debates and apparatus work.

The initiative group's platform was set forth briefly but succinctly in a political report delivered by USSR People's Deputy Professor A. Denisov. The speaker proceeded from the premise that it is not socialist teaching in general that has suffered defeat today, but only the extremist, bolshevik current in the socialist movement. The collapse of totalitarian socialism has in no way affected the natural process of maturation of socialist principles within the developed capitalist society and the current relatively peaceful fusion of socialism with capitalism. And this worldwide trend will prevail regardless, and socialism will sooner or later spring up in our country.

Therefore, the conscious activity of organized socialist forces should only promote this natural process, with a view to facilitating it and accelerating it by means, first, of publicizing the attractive face of humane, free, and democratic socialism, and, second, by means of socialist reforms implemented through democratic organs of power and administration. And coercion should give way to a humane, caring attitude to the individual, so that the overdue reforms take shape only in a well-prepared, mature social consciousness, which was so badly lacking among the bolsheviks and is now so badly lacking among democrats who try forcibly to impose prototypical, primitive capitalism. The all-out privatization that has begun will inevitably lead to plundering of society's property and even greater ruin.

"The party should disassociate itself from various utopian Marxist and Bolshevik doctrines and become the party of common sense, with its activity based on Marxist dialectics, if we want to preserve our commitment to Marxism," A.A. Denisov said.

This also means that the party will defend the interests of those who provide hired labor, on the basis not so much of abstract systems as of analysis of the concrete sociopolitical situation.

Here it is important to avoid allowing the monopoly of state ownership, with the dictatorship of the bureaucrat, simply to be replaced by the monopoly of the private owner, with the inevitable dictatorship of money. Therefore, the party should uphold the principle that ownership by the whole people and collective ownership should account for a substantial proportion of social production, without objecting to the private entrepreneur holding sway in the sphere of services to the population. And let these systems compete freely with each other. The need was also stressed to defend the real achievements of socialism enshrined in the RSFSR Constitution—the right to labor, leisure, health care, housing, provision in old age, and free education, as well as the international solidarity of working people of all nations.

There may be different views of the above platform, but it cannot be denied that it is clearly defined. And this gave rise to another thesis that was also constantly on the lips of A. Denisov, R. Medvedev, and I. Rybkin and L. Vartazarova, who chaired the conference: What is happening today is not the revival of the CPSU or the creation of some kind of movement of left-wing orientation, but the foundation of a very specific party—a socialist party; if anyone objects in principle to the idea of a new party, if anyone wants to stay in the CPSU, which is already dead, then let them do so, no one is making them join this new party.

This line was pursued by the conference organizers with admirable firmness. Proposals that the term "communist" should be retained in the party's name—proposals which, it emerged in the course of the debate, were by no means merely formal—were rejected, as were proposals for the creation of a movement of all Left-wing forces. The principle of a party identity, comparatively broad, but with a specific political face, prevailed. When this finally became clear, it led to a reaction that is only natural in political life.

Thus conference delegate V. Tyulkin, one of the leaders of the Initiative Congress of Communists of Russia, on behalf of its organizational bureau, welcomed the formation of the Socialist Party of Working People and expressed the hope that in future it will be a useful ally for the Communists. The only thing we object to, he said, is noncommunist parties being formed on the basis of the CPSU. In his opinion, to do this is to abandon a sinking ship and take your suitcase with you to another ship, and so the initiative congress will continue its efforts to preserve the Communist Party, and will meet in Yekaterinburg to that end on 23 November. V. Tyulkin and a number of his supporters did not participate in the vote on the conference's final resolution.

Delegates representing the Marxist platform, for their part, while complaining that their proposals had not been taken into account by the initiative group during the drafting of the conference documents, nonetheless declared that they would join the new party, but as a separate faction.

By a majority of votes, with five against and 15 abstentions, the conference adopted a resolution on the foundation of the Socialist Party of Working People and approved a program statement and statutes giving party members, organizations, and platforms broad democratic rights and autonomy. The statutes contain a clause to the effect that a party member may not belong to other parties, but in view of the well-known complexity and uncertainty of the present political situation, the conference resolved to deem it permissible for those members of the Socialist Party of Working People who so wish, to maintain their membership of the CPSU until such time as the CPSU's fate is decided in accordance with the procedure laid down by law. It was decided to convene the first party congress in December of this year. An organizing committee of 63 people was elected to prepare for the congress.

Observer Looks at CPSU's 'Miserable Finale'

PM3010161491 Moscow NEW TIMES in English No. 40, 8-14 Oct 91 p 9

[Article by Lev Bezymenskiy "Observer's View": "The Party Isn't Over"]

[Text] The opponents of the Communist Party could not even have dreamt of such a rapid ouster of their target from the political scene. What does the communist exodus mean? Leaving the ideological disputes about communism, socialism and revisionism aside, let us consider the consequences of this exodus for the country. With the CPSU out, the Soviet Union has lost the last factor keeping the country together. If new Communist or Socialist parties appear, they will never be all-Union parties. The very pattern of the union of sovereign states will not allow any new CPSU to appear.

Who is to blame for the CPSU's miserable finale? The CPSU's leadership, which stubbornly refused to accept the new realities and to accept recognize the old blunders seemed so unshakeable that it was sort of asking for purely administrative measures to be taken against it. The Communist Party's regional and district committees have been sealed (not in all republics though) and the party apparatchiks are hunting for jobs. I am writing this with no gloating, but with a feeling of sadness. Did it really have to come to this?

The situation is absurd. The paralysis of the CPSU and the political surrender of its leadership reached the point where the Central Committee was unable even to express its attitude to Mikhail Gorbachev's resignation from the post of the General Secretary and suggestion that the Central Committee dissolve itself, to say nothing of acting as the president suggested. Secretaries of the Central Committee are said to be convening somewhere discussing something, patiently waiting for the new authorities' permission to hold a plenum. Meanwhile, the traces of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Russia are nowhere to be found. Once again, let us not gloat over the CP's [Communist Party's] plight. The so often mentioned "millions of rank-and-file communists," whose party dues used to be the source of the apparatchiks' good life for so many years, deserve more than the devil-may-care attitude the party leaders are showing them now. Today the former have to decide what to do next and which party to join (or not to join any) independently.

While they contemplate their future, though, strange things are happening in some republics. Everybody was astonished when the Communist Party of Kazakhstan turned into a socialist party, and the Communist Party of Uzbekistan became a popular-democratic party overnight. This transformation (especially in the case of Uzbekistan) is widely suspected to be an attempt to camouflage the old CP structures. In Tajikistan, where the Communist Party was banned, these structures put up even stronger resistance by staging mass demonstrations. As a result, they toppled the parliamentary leadership of Tajikistan and imposed a state of emergency in the republic.

Fortunately, the events in Tajikistan did not take a violent turn: the Army refused to put down the popular protests, and the street confrontations brought the heirs of the Communist Party to a stalemate. Nonetheless, the reports from Dushanbe are alarming. No "post-communist epoch" has come, contrary to the naive expectations of the pro-democracy forces. Some segments, and not only in Central Asia, tend to forget the lessons of August and even issue cynical statements that Yanayev was a fool and next time cleverer methods will be used...

The ideology that resulted in the coup lives on. Significantly, the authors of the "Word to the Nation," an appeal of leading conservatives published shortly before the coup and containing some key elements of the putschists' programme, have not distanced themselves from that instigative call. On the contrary, speaking at a recent meeting of the Union of Writers of Russia, they publicly confirmed their advocacy of this policy. Evidently, they must be counting on something. The Pamyat society is staging a comeback, and anti-Semitic slogans have desecrated the graves of WW2 victims in Kiev, where fifty years ago Nazis exterminated a great number of Jews at Babiy Yar. New "enemies" are being looked for, while the aggravating economic chaos is playing into the hands of those who would like to avenge the August defeat, especially as the CPSU activities were only "suspended," and not banned altogether and the inertia of the past persists on a scale democrats could never expect.

What path could a former Communist choose? The Bolsheviks of the Communist Initiative are going to convene soon. Nina Andreyeva's party has long raised the banner of struggle for the ideals of Marx-Engels-Lenin-Stalin. There have been calls to establish a new, moderate Labour Party. The followers of Aleksandr Rutskoy's Democratic Party Communists of Russia are getting ready for a congress. However, these movements are remote from the bulk of the party, whose members are not at all sure they really need to join any party in the future. It is none other than the CPSU that made party membership and participation in political activities repulsive to most rank-and-file members. This may easily be the worst legacy of the outgoing party. It is much more difficult to get rid of this legacy than to seal the CPSU premises and to feed detective stories about CPSU Money in Swiss banks to the reading public.

Public Associations for Democracy Formed

LD3010195391 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1955 GMT 28 Oct 91

[by TASS correspondent Galina Vinitskaya]

[Text] Moscow 28 October (TASS)—Two new public associations, the "Business for Democracy Foundation" and the "20 August Club" were formed today at a constituent conference in Moscow. They aim to promote the establishment of a single democratic space and support for social, political and economic stability in the USSR by coordinating the efforts of progressive business circles and pro-democracy politicians.

Vitaliy Stepanov, spokesman for the organizing committee and general director of the "MIA" foreign-economic association, told TASS that the democratic forces' victory in August was merely the initial step toward building a truly democratic state. To prevent a return to the dark days of totalitarianism, he said, it is essential that businessmen and politicians join forces.

Desire to join these organizations has already been voiced by Eduard Shevardnadze, leader of the Foreign Policy Association; USSR People's Deputy Aleksandr Vladislavlev (vice president of the Scientific and Industrial Alliance) and Vladimir Tikhonov (president of the USSR Union of Allied Cooperatives); representatives of numerous banks, private sector and industrial enterprises, and public organizations; and the workforces of a number of newspapers and news agencies, including the "Flora-Moskva" bank, the McDonalds and Pizza Hut restaurants, the Union of USSR Scientific and Engineering Societies, the KURANTY newspaper, and INTERFAX.

The foundation will promote the formation of a legal framework for political lobbying in the country, finance work on draft legislation, and give financial support to democratically orientated political parties, trends and media outlets. It will also invest in education centers for training professional politicians, and finance educational and cultural initiatives.

Bakatin on Reform of Intelligence Services

92US0077A Moscow TRUD in Russian 25 Oct 91 p 1

[V. Snegirev report on news conference given by V. Bakatin, former chairman of the USSR KGB, in his office on 24 October: "Goodbye, KGB"]

[Text] According to V. Bakatin, former chairman of what is now already the former USSR KGB, there are currently many security officers, particularly on the periphery, who are not doing what they should be doing. Confusion reigns, it would seem, in the ranks of what was even yesterday a most powerful department. The main thing now, therefore, V. Bakatin believes, is to clearly define the new functions of the special services as quickly as possible, delineate duties, and make provision for a legal base.

By a decree of the USSR State Council the KGB has been finally abolished. The central intelligence service of the USSR, an interrepublic security service, and the committee for protection of the state border of the Union with the joint command of the border forces are being formed on the basis of the former. V. Bakatin himself, who yesterday received in his office a group of journalists of central newspapers, will evidently head the security service, although he does not as yet know what his office will be called. As far as Ye. Primakov is concerned, he will henceforward be director of the independent central intelligence service, whose headquarters, it is now known, will be located in the area of the Yasenevo residential neighborhood beyond the Moscow beltway.

The strength of the state security authorities was officially made public at the news conference for the first time. Thus prior to the putsch some 490,000 persons worked in the KGB, but following the detachment from its structure of the Government Communications Directorate and the Security Service, the strength of the authorities declined immediately by 85,000. Some 240,000 remain at border positions, 90,000 are employees of peripheral authorities, and 15,000 are intelligence officers. All the rest, minus the Russian Committee, will remain under V. Bakatin's jurisdiction.

The KGB Board has been eliminated, and the coordinating council which has been formed will meet for its first session on Monday [28 October].

Answering the TRUD correspondent's question as to how the work of the commission investigating the activity of the KGB formed immediately following the putsch was progressing and whether the reorganization should not have waited until the appearance of the latter's expert appraisal, V. Bakatin replied that the commission's preliminary findings were not in conflict with his actions. Waiting for the final results would have meant losing a whole two months, which would seem impermissible.

V. Bakatin declared that his service would immediately take on crime and, particularly, corruption. Very well, we will await the results.

Economic Relations Ministry To Be Absorbed

OW3110114591 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1015 GMT 31 Oct 91

[From "Soviet Business Report"; transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] "In the very near future," the USSR's Ministry of Foreign Economic Relations will cease to exist and will be incorporated into the Russian Republic's Ministry of Foreign Economic Relations, INTERFAX was told by a central government press spokesman. It is assumed that the Russian ministry's authority will be enlarged and that it will encompass licensing, the issuance of quotas, the determination of customs policies and the examination of problems concerning foreign economic ties.

All the foreign trade associations that were part of the USSR's Ministry of Foreign Economic Relations are scheduled to be reorganized as joint stock companies (At present, of the more than 80 foreign trade associations fewer than lO are joint stock companies). The USSR trading offices located abroad will be able to continue functioning as "representatives for those republics which wish to utilize their services," the spokeman added.

Pankin Dismisses Russian Counterpart's 'Slip'

PM2910123791 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 29 Oct 91 Union Edition p 7

[Unattributed report: "B. Pankin's Reaction to A. Kozyrev's Statement"]

[Text] Boris Pankin regarded as a slip of the tongue the statement by Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Foreign Minister Andrey Kozyrev that "the USSR Foreign Ministry in its current form does not accord with the interests of the Russian Federation and the other republics or with the formation of a renewed Union." Prior to my Near East trip, the USSR foreign minister said, there was total agreement over common tasks, the coordination of effort, and the distribution of powers between the Union and republic ministries. M. Gorbachev and B. Yeltsin are in total agreement on this point.

TASS Carries Press Review for 31 Oct

LD3110085191 Moscow TASS in English 0635 GMT 31 Oct 91

["Press review"—TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow October 31 TASS—Newspapers highlight the work of the Congress of People's Deputies of the Russian Federation, which completed the creation of the constitutional court on Wednesday [30 October] and began to discuss Russia's socio-economic situation, as well as the opening of the peace conference on the Middle East in Madrid on Wednesday.

Newspapers continue to publish materials commenting on the economic programme put forward by Yeltsin at the Congress of People's Deputies. Russian People's Deputy Tatyana Karyagina, an economist, has contributed an article to SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA. She predicts the collapse of Yeltsin's reform programme and believes that if the programme is adopted, the Soviet Union "may immediately become the leading country by the rate of inflation and the unemployment level."

RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA carries an interview with the Russian Minister of Labour Nikolay Shokhin, which is entitled "Russian Reform: Road to Controlled Crisis." He believes the independent and strong economic policy pursued by Russia is the only real possibility to preserve a community on the territory of the former Soviet Union.

PRAVDA publishes an interview with the well-known economist Nikolay Shmelyov. He says "the root causes of our tragedy lie not so much in politics, as in the economy. We are reaping the fruits of irresponsibility of Gorbachev's closest aides—Ligachev, Ryzhkov and Pavlov (it is not for me to judge the degree of responsibility of Gorbachev himself). They destroyed the foundation on which any normal society is based, be it socialist, capitalist or any other."

PRAVDA carries a report from Madrid, which says that the peace conference on the Middle East began with a success, because its opening is a success in itself. There is no paradox in this statement. It is the recognition of the real situation, because the opening could have been disrupted at the very last moment. The efforts exerted by Washington and Moscow for many years finally brought to the negotiating table those who were divided for decades by bloody strife.

NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA writes about the stand assumed by the Soviet delegation at the Madrid peace conference.

RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA carries a report under the heading "Sensations of Our Days," which says that Valeriy Neverov, a Russian businessman, donated five million roubles to the Foundation for the Restoration of the Christ the Saviour Cathedral. He urged all businessmen of the country to take most active part in the restoration of the cathedral. In his opinion, the cathedral should become "the principal monument to victory over Bolshevism."

PRAVDA correspondent M. Odinets writes in the newspaper about the situation at the Chernobyl nuclear power plant after the latest accident. He points out that, as the October 11 developments showed, "few lessons have been drawn from the grim experience of the 1986 catastrophe at the Chernobyl nuclear power plant."

PRAVDA carries an interview with Vladimir Kamennykh, commandant of the Lenin mausoleum. He regards a possible decision to remove Lenin from the mausoleum and bury him in some other place as "a mistake, a tragic mistake, which can never be corrected."

Speaking at the opening of the Russian Congress of People's Deputies, President Yeltsin said he had signed a decree on providing a legal foundation for the activities of trade unions, as was promised. RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA publishes today the decree "on the rights of trade unions in conditions of the transition to a market- based economy."

TRUD carries an interview with Abad Rizayeva, head of the Trade Union Federation of Turkmenia, which deals with ways of resolving the main problems facing Turkmen working people. She believes "a constituent congress of trade unions is needed." In her opinion, the General Confederation of Trade Unions should play the part of an international trade union association within the framework of the future union of sovereign states.

"The liquidation of chemical weapons is not a task of secondary importance. It is no less important than nuclear disarmament," says Major General Igor Yevstafyev, head of the chemical warfare department. He recalls in an interview with RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA that the state programme of the elimination of chemical weapons in the USSR costs 10 billion roubles, according to the latest estimates.

TRUD carries a report from the enhanced-regime labour camp, where former Colonel General Yuriy Churbanov is kept. At the end of the interview Churbanov told the TRUD correspondent: "Do not look for sensations in the labour camp."

NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA and KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA carry and comment on the documents of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee "On Urgent Measures To Organise Commercial and Foreign Economic Activities of the Party" and "On Overdue Payment of Debts to Firms of Friendly Parties."

RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA carries an interview with Mikhail Lemeshev, a well-known ecologist and U.N. expert on the national environment. He describes as self-deception "the idea hammered into our heads that the West will help us." He believes "Russia is too great to fit into the European structure."

Colonel General Yuriy Rodionov, Soviet deputy defence minister in charge of the personnel and head of the main personnel department of the Defence Ministry, has given an interview to KRASNAYA ZVEZDA. Explaining the issues dealing with the reforming of the Soviet Armed Forces, he stresses that in the course of the implementation of the military reform the course has been set towards the promotion of younger officers. Rodionov points out that it has been decided to preserve the best intellectual potential of the Army and the Navy, until their substitutes undergo proper training."

Economic

Statistics Indicate Economic Situation Worse

LD3010123791 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 2200 GMT 29 Oct 91

[Text] The country's economic situation continues to worsen, becoming critical. This is clear from the State Statistics Committee publication, distributed on 29 October to USSR Supreme Soviet members. In particular, the document states that without counting the Baltic republics, the grain harvest has dropped by 25 percent in comparison with last year. The State Statistics Committee assesses unemployment at 2 million. The budget deficit planned for this year is 200-240 billion rubles, out of which the deficit in the Union budget will be of 120 billion. During the first three quarters of the present year, there was 3.6 times more cash put into circulation than during the same period last year.

Foreign Tourism Suffers Drastic Reductions

OW3010020191 Moscow INTERFAX in English 2120 GMT 29 Oct 91

[From "Soviet Business Report"; transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Throughout the course of 1991, foreign tourism in the Soviet Union has exhibited new fundamental tendencies: The overall reduction in the number of tourists; the reduced role of the State Committee on Foreign Tourism, also known as Intourist, which now controls only 38% of the market; the rapidly increasing number of new tourist agencies (there are now about 600); and the stable growth of the hotel network across the Soviet Union.

Intourist is not the leading tourist company of the Soviet Union, but it is still the largest. For decades, it held a monopolistic grip on foreign tourism in the USSR; however, in the last few years, its position has deteriorated. While in 1988, it handled 76% of foreign tourism, its market share fell to 41.5% in 1990. A further decline to around 38% is forecast for 1991. Although new tourist companies are quickly sprouting up, Intourist remains the Soviet Union's most deeply-rooted tourist organization, boasting 800 permanent partners, 25 branches in foreign countries, and 13 joint ventures. In an attempt to retain its market position, Intourist has divided into several joint-stock companies, such as Intourservis, Intourtrans, Intourreklama, etc., and in July, these joint-stock companies formed a holding company. Meanwhile, the Intourist branches in the independence-minded Soviet republics also began forming joint-stock companies. Hotels are now independent legal entities, and the all-Union joint-stock company Intourist (one of

Intourist's joint stock companies) concludes agreements with hotels in order to place its tourists.

In 1991, 2.3 times fewer tourists have come to the Soviet Union through Intourist and its divisions. Overall, 329,000 tourists visited the Soviet Union through Intourist between January and September of 1991. The main reason for the sharp decrease is the dramatic 2000% fall in tourism from East European countries. Traditionally, approximately half of all tourists came from the neighboring region. The proportional share of East European visitors fell to 3% of all tourists in 1991, down from 28% in 1990.

West Europe is sending 150% fewer visitors to the Soviet Union. In 1991, the number of tourists from various countries sank: Germany by 50%, England by 50%, France by 49.4%, USA by 51.8%, and Italy by 53.3%. The general trend is emphasized by the shrinking number of tourists from Finland, until recently a main source of tourists. In 1991, 54.5% fewer Finns have visited the Soviet Union.

Number of Foreigners Who Visited the Soviet Union through Intourist from January-June 1991 (major countries)

Country	January-June 1990	January-June 1991
Finland	47,872	26,128
Germany	41,350	20,754
England	32,114	16,168
USA	31,824	16,513
Italy	26,727	14,260
France	21,929	10,851
Japan	18,733	15,023
Bulgaria	5,001	13
Hungary	4,884	350
GDR (East Germany)	54,130	2
Poland	18,902	482
Romania	35,629	762
Czechoslovakia	9,691	31
Yugoslavia	7,113	3,555

As well as a general reduction in the number of foreign tourists, experts also note a trend toward individual tourism rather than group plans. The destinations are changing as well. There are few trips to Central Asia and the Caucasus due to security concerns. New routes are also opening up: the Volga region, the Urals, Western Siberia, and Kamchatka.

The number of closed cities has been slashed by two times. Now, closed areas account for only 6.2% of the country's territory. Tourists have recently gained access to Sverdlovsk, Kaliningrad, Nikolayev, Arkhangelsk, Saratov, Nizhniy Novgorod, Krasnoyarsk, Tomsk, Omsk, Chita, Yakutsk, Petropavlovsk-Kamchatskiy, etc. Vladivostok, the industrial center and port in the Far East, will become an open city as of January 1, 1992. The process for gaining permission to visit closed areas has been greatly simplified.

The Soviet Union has now opened new border crossing points: Sapri on the Turkish border; Khorgos and Torugart on the Chinese border; Lotta, Viartsilia, and Sviatogorsk on the Finnish border. Travelling and living in the Soviet Union has become less dangerous. Intourist and other tourist agencies are taking various steps to guarantee their guests' safety. A special brigade of taxis oufitted with two-way radios brings tourists and businesspeople from the airport to Moscow's city center. On the route between Vyborg and St. Petersburg, foreign automobiles whiz by, outfitted with special alarm systems and personal computers. Hotels are maintaining a stronger sense of order.

Recently, Crown Life Insurance, Canada, and the Soviet state organization Ingosstrakh made an agreement to create insurance plans for foreign tourists travelling to the Soviet Union. The Canadian partner will have tourists fill out insurance papers before their departure to the Soviet Union.

Presently, a network for selling the new insurance is being established. Possible participants include Soviet tour organizers, Intourist's partners, and perhaps airlines. People who buy the insurance can use services offered by a 24-hour medical center.

Agricultural

Statistics Indicate Famine Not 'Inevitable'

PM3010124491 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 30 Oct 91 p 1

[Unattributed statistical report, plus commentary by USSR People's Deputy A. Yemelyanov, VASKHNIL, V.I. Lenin All-Union Academy of Agricultural Sciences, academician: "The Battle for the Harvest Always Includes Plans for Casualties"]

[Text] **Statistics**

According to the latest figures, the harvesting of grain and pulse crops in the country has virtually finished. Some 156.3 million tonnes of grain has been threshed. Last year the figure was 217.8 million tonnes. The average yield is 16.5 quintals per hectare, which is 5.5 quintals below last year's level.

Some 38.5 million tonnes of grain has been purchased for state resources, or 50 percent of the state order, which was fulfilled by only 11 oblasts in the Russian Federation, six oblasts in Belarus, and four oblasts in Kazakhstan.

The potato harvest has been completed. The yield was 99 quintals per hectare, which is six quintals less than in 1990. The sugar beet harvest is nearing completion.

Some 47 million tonnes of roots have been procured. Some 2,636,000 tonnes of sugar has been produced.

Since the beginning of the season 6,707,000 tonnes of raw cotton has been procured (90 percent of the plan).

Some 256,700 tonnes of flax fiber has been purchased. Last year it was 170,000 tonnes.

The quantity of coarse and succulent feed laid in, converted into feed units, is 107.3 million tonnes, which is 21 million tonnes less than last year.

Commentary

The figures in themselves offer no grounds for saying that a famine is inevitable this winter. True, the harvest is lower than last year, especially in the case of grain. But in the main it is not bad. Let us not forget that last summer nature gave us an unprecedented harvest. And nonetheless we scoured the world to buy grain and other products and collected ignominious and humiliating humanitarian aid. In 1990 it was as if the Almighty had deliberately given us a harvest like that in order to expose the uselessness of our system.

In good years, losses of produce increase to an incredible extent. The system of storage, transportation, and processing is not yet capable of "swallowing" everything. So losses are great even in ordinary years, and even greater in years when the harvest is good. This means that this year's level could actually turn out to be not much lower than last year's. Let us not forget that the weather was good throughout the fall, which is extremely important for the quality of produce and its keeping qualities.

What can and must be done to ensure that the theoretical possibility of famine does not become a reality?

Effective incentives are needed to encourage kolkhozes and sovkhozes to sell food to the state. At the moment they are holding back grain, and other produce too, without even fulfilling the food tax and the state order. Issuing commands is no use here. The increase in prices is not helping. The farms cannot buy the resources they need with their devalued rubles. So they are forced to hold back food for barter deals. The industrialists act like monopolists. The peasants have no one to turn to, no choice. Therefore, representatives of industry dictate the ratios that suit them for exchanges in kind. It is necessary to quickly find opportunities for allocating resources to kolkhozes and sovkhozes in exchange for food. You may ask, where should these resources be taken from? From other sectors. And in part from the city dwellers, and they should not feel aggrieved about it. For instance, additional quotas of cars and consumer goods should be allocated for these purposes.

The collapse of the food market is largely due to the breaking of economic ties between republics and regions. Traditional deliveries are being broken off and new ties have not yet been established. Therefore the priority task for the leaders of states (republics) is to seek contacts, to look for compromises and consensus, so as not to exacerbate the situation. Food imports and humanitarian aid are inevitable. But everything possible must be done to ensure that the smallest possible proportion of this aid gets stolen.

It must be taken into account that food prices are rising. And food will become simply unaffordable for some population categories. Therefore, it is high time to think about organizing charity canteens and other means of providing free or concessionary food to pensioners, especially those living on their own.

At the same time there must be a radical restructuring of the infrastructure, in order to drastically reduce food losses. This will make it possible to minimize large-scale food imports. Over the last 10 years, $20-23 billion a year has been spent on this. But how can we explain the paradoxical situation that has become the norm? In exchange for imported grain and other food, every year we export masses of petroleum products. And meanwhile, at our busiest times, combines, tractors, and other equipment are standing idle because of the shortage of fuel! The conditions must be created right now for the development of a new system in the countryside, making it possible to mold people who truly care about the land.

Estonia

Guided Missiles Stolen From Tallinn Garrison

OW3010135091 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1220 GMT 30 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The Tallinn newspaper "VECHERNIY COURIER" ("EVENING COURIER") reports that 44 anti-tank guided missile systems and anti-aircraft missiles "Strela-2" and "Strela-3" have been stolen from an artillery base of the Tallinn military garrison.

Meanwhile, the newspaper says, Tallinn's "black market" offers various arms for sale. For example, 1,000 cartridges cost 4,500 rubles. According to "VECHERNIY COURIER," one shadow economy dealer said that he would pay $20,000 for 1 kg of red mercury used in missile and torpedo guidance systems.

USSR Military Train Arrives Unannounced

OW3110135791 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1155 GMT 31 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Madis Oiglane, a railway traffic controller, has informed BF [BALTFAX] that on Wednesday [30 October] a military echelon arrived at Klooga station outside Tallinn where it was unloaded.

The Soviet military did not notify the Estonian Government about the arrival of the train, though this was provided for by the agreement between Defence Minister Yevgeniy Shaposhnikov and the Estonian Prime Minister Edgar Savisaar.

The acting chief of the Estonian general staff Ants Laaneots has told BF's correspondent that if reinforcements are transferred to Estonian territory, the Soviet Union violates the understanding under which the personnel of units in Estonian territory should not increase.

The head of the Defence Department Toomas Puura has told BF that the train came from Kazakhstan where the soldiers were involved in harvesting and that four more trains are expected in the near future.

Shaposhnikov in Armenia, Meets Ter-Petrosyan

LD3010222691 Moscow TASS in English 1341 GMT 30 Oct 91

[By TASS correspondent Tigran Liloyan]

[Text] Yerevan October 30 TASS—Air Marshal Yevgeniy Shaposhnikov, USSR minister of defence, arrived here today. He was received by Armenia's President Levon Ter-Petrosyan.

The secretariat of the president's office have not commented so far in any way on the purpose of the minister's arrival or the contents of the conversation.

Latvia

Yeltsin, Gorbunovs Discuss Economic Ties

OW3010160191 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1445 GMT 30 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Earlier today Russian President Boris Yeltsin and Chairman of the Latvian parliament Anatolijs Gorbunovs had a telephone conversation (on Mr. Yeltsin's initiative) to discuss bilateral economic relations and the protection of ethnic Russians living in Latvia.

Mr. Yeltsin and Mr. Gorbunovs agreed to form governmental delegations for the preparation of a comprehensive treaty between Russia and Latvia as two independent states building their relations on the basis of international law.

Russia concluded an interstate treaty with Latvia in January of 1991 before the latter declared its sovereignty. However, the Russian parliament has not yet ratified it despite Latvia's insistence. Addressing the Congress of Russian People's Deputies October 28th, Mr. Yeltsin pointed out that in dealing with the republics Russia will abide by international law. In his words, the introduction of world prices in trade with them is a form of recognizing their independence.

Economic Relations With Russia Discussed

Accused of 'Economic Warfare'

PM3110094691 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 30 Oct 91 Union Edition p 1

[Untitled report from IZVESTIYA, TASS, RIA, POSTFAKTUM, UPI column]

[Text] Russia's relations with Latvia in the economic sphere have deteriorated since the signing of the treaty among eight republics.

So said Andris Gutmanis, the republic's first deputy minister for the economy. According to him, for instance, the Volga Motor Vehicle Plant has stated that spare parts for Zhigulis will be supplied to Latvia only for freely convertible currency. Gutmanis said that Latvia, too, "could demand payment in freely convertible currency for many of its goods: More than 20 plants in the republic have a monopoly across the whole of the former USSR." Janis Dinevic, chairman of the parliamentary faction of the Latvian People's Front, described the present state of affairs as "economic warfare by Russia against Latvia."

Economic Blockade Viewed

*OW3110021891 Moscow BALTFAX in English
2025 GMT 30 Oct 91*

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] In an interview to the DIENA newspaper, the chairman of Lativan parliament's economic commission, Mr. Ojars Kehris, admitted that allegations about Russia's maintaining an economic blockade against Latvia are groundless. "We have no right to demand that Russia sell us whatever products we want at low prices," he declared.

According to Mr. Kehris, difficulties may only arise at the settlement stage, since neither country has enough foreign exchange. "However, clearing could be used instead," he said.

Economic Talks 'Strained'

*OW3010215791 Moscow BALTFAX in English
2025 GMT 30 Oct 91*

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Latvia's first deputy minister of the economy, Mr. Andris Gutmanis, told a BALTFAX correspondent that the October 28 meeting of the delegations charged with preparation of an economic agreement between Latvia and Russia for 1992 was "somewhat strained" because of a fuel crisis beginning in Latvia.

For a variety of reasons, the oil which Latvia's state-owned association Latvijas Nafta has purchased at Russia's commodity exchanges is not being delivered. Mr. Gutmanis says that the Russian delegation, for their part, accused Latvia of re-exporting Russian oil to the West, an accusation which he described as "completely unfounded".

All in all, the misunderstanding was quickly cleared up, with both parties agreeing that the main reason behind the crisis was the country's "general mess", he said.

The meeting produced an agreement to increase from 36 to 200 the number of products which will be traded on a clearing basis at world prices. It was the Russians who made concessions with respect to this agreement, Mr. Gutmanis said. "While earlier, Russians used to think that trade at world prices would mean that they would be selling us raw materials for foreign exchange and buy our products at free prices for roubles, they now recognize that they too will have to buy many Latvian products at world prices", he went on, adding that in his opinion hard currency will have to be paid for electric locomotives and electrical equipment, and for the use of Latvian seaports.

As for the rent for land used by military bases, Mr. Gutmanis said that Latvia would also request payment in hard currency and that this issue had already been brought up by Latvia. "It is at yet unclear, though, with whom to negotiate about this issue—with the USSR or Russia ", he pointed out.

The next meeting of the delegations responsible for preparing the Russian-Latvian economic agreement for 1992 will take place on November 8.

Shift to World Prices Assailed

*OW3010170291 Moscow BALTFAX in English
1220 GMT 30 Oct 91*

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] In an interviev vith BF [BALTFAX] First Deputy Chairman of the Latvian parliament Dainis Ivans called Russia's decision to conduct trade with the republics in accordance with world prices and settle with them in hard currency "an absurdity." He believes "Russia needs Latvian-made products and Latvia needs Russian resources."

Mr. Ivans said that Latvia may demand the introduction of world prices on its products. He spoke in favor of clearing trade with Russia. He also noted that "there is no tragedy for Latvia in the introduction of world prices by Russia."

"Latvia will simply have to turn to the West having not only world prices but products of better quality as well," he said.

Mr. Ivans admitted that Latvia is already facing "certain energy crisis." Fuel is available without any restrictions to official automobiles only.

Interest in Purchasing Army Property Noted

*OW3110042191 Moscow BALTFAX in English
1445 GMT 30 Oct 91*

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Peteris Simpsons, a member of the Latvian parliamentary Commission on Internal Affairs and Defense, has said in Riga that some firms have displayed interest in the Soviet Army's property in Latvian territory. He said that his commission has the information about the recent visit of major Soviet firms' representatives, including the Interbanking Association Menatep, who came to Latvia in order to buy the Army's real estate—barracks, docks, runways, etc.

In this connection, Mr. Simpsons emphasized that "all facilities built on Latvian soil, including military ones, are the property of Latvia." The Latvian Government is determined to take strict control over the Army's property to prevent its removal from Latvia. Mr. Simpsons did not exclude the possibility that the Army's property would be purchased by Latvian businessmen.

Machine Guns, Pistols Bought

LD3110000291 Riga Radio Riga Network in Latvian 0500 GMT 29 Oct 91

[Text] At a press conference yesterday, Latvian Internal Affairs Minister Aloizs Vaznis informed journalists that the new draft for the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs was discussed in Moscow last week. It provides that the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs completely (?renounces) its administrative function and will take on the role of coordinator. If the draft is accepted, then Latvia will have to work on specific questions with the interior ministries of the republics of the USSR, but the Union Ministry will be able to assist only with information and materials concerned with methods, Aloizs Vaznis said.

A set of weapons has been bought from the USSR: 250 sub-machine guns and 100 pistols. This is the first purchase of weapons by agreement since the restoration of independence. It was possible to buy the weapons for the same price for which they are sold to the republics of the USSR, and they will be in Latvia this week.

Report on Interior Minister's Talks in Moscow

LD3010234191 Riga Radio Riga Network in Latvian 0900 GMT 29 Oct 91

[Text] Aloizs Vaznis, Minister of Internal Affairs of Latvia, held another press conference on Monday [28 October] at which he told journalists about the results of his visit to Moscow. He said that the withdrawal of the USSR Internal Troops from the Republic of Latvia has already begun.

In Moscow, Vaznis met with Barannikov, the USSR minister of internal affairs, Dunayev, the Russian minister of internal affairs, and Savin, commander in chief of the USSR interior forces. In the middle of November, a treaty is due to be signed with Barannikov and Dunayev on cooperation between the interior ministries, in which arrangements for the extradition of criminals are provided.

Deputy Claims Military Property Being Removed

LD3010184991 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 1300 GMT 30 Oct 91

[Text] According to a statement by deputy Petris Dzimsens of Latvia's Supreme Soviet, the parliamentary Commission for Defense and Internal Affairs has information that Union structures such as the Menatep association are showing increasing interest in the Armed Forces property located on the territory of the Baltic region. It could be military barracks or dock installations, but then property disputes might arise. According to reports from the area Army property is being speedily removed from Latvian territory and this process is not being supervised by anyone. The problem of Armed Forces' property should be discussed at interstate talks between the Latvian Republic and the USSR.

Ivans Says Single State Not Yet Feasible

OW3010191291 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1730 GMT 30 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] There are no real grounds as yet for the establishment of something like a single Baltic state said Dainis Ivans, first deputy chairman of the Latvian Supreme Soviet in an interview to BF [BALTFAX]. "In the remote future it would be possible to mention something along the lines of a Swiss confederation but for now it is an Utopia," says Ivans.

Ivans emphasized that he supported the idea of close cooperation between the Baltic countries but not one expressed in any state structures, federative or confederative.

According to him, the most serious obstacle to participation in common programmes for the three states is their economic competition. "While we have similar political structures, the similarity of our economic development is a deterrent. We are competitors even if we don't want to be," said Ivans. He believes that the first step toward the solution of the problem will be the adoption of a common customs legislation of all the Baltic republics.

In connection with the Russian leadership's statement concerning switching trade with the seceding republics to world prices, Ivans emphasized that Latvia would demand the same. "This will apply not only to trade but to other issues as well, for example, the land occupied by the Soviet troops," said he. Ivans also believes that the Soviet army must pay taxes: "It has been on our soil for 50 years and it does not pay a kopeck to local budgets and to the republican budget using the infrastructures of our state," said the Latvian leader.

Opposition on Existence of Political Prisoners

OW3110022091 Moscow BALTFAX in English 2025 GMT 30 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Speaking at a press-conference in Riga on October 30, the leader of the "Equal Rights" opposition group in Latvian parliament, Mr. Sergey Dimanis, said that former Latvian Communist Party boss, Mr. Alfreds Rubiks, his adviser, Mr. Serdyukov, and former OMON [Special Purpose Militia Detachment] riot police officer Sergey Parfyonov have become the first prisoners of conscience in the Latvian Republic.

Mr. Rubiks was arrested in violation of the requirements of international law, opposition deputies claim. Being a People's Deputy of the USSR, he could not be arrested on the territory of another state, said a member of the "Equal Rights" group, Mr. Grigoriy Morozli. In his opinion, Mr. Parfyonov's arrest was also unlawful.

According to Mr. Dimanis, the wives of neither Mr. Rubiks, nor Mr. Parfyonov have been allowed to see their husbands, nor are they given information about their husbands' health.

"I believe that the outcome of investigations will not depend on its findings. The fate of these prisoners is an example of a crackdown on opposition", concluded Mr. Dimanis.

Polish Travel for Tourists, Businessmen Barred

OW3010191591 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1730 GMT 30 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] To restrict the outflow of goods from Latvia, Latvia's deputy premier Ilmars Bisers signed a decree to stop the issuing of permits to enter Poland until January 1, 1992, to tourists and those travelling on private business.

A trip on official business would now require an exit visa. The Latvian Foreign Ministry's consular department was instructed to investigate the need for every trip on official business.

Until December 1, 1991, the Foreign Ministry, the Interior Ministry, the Public Security Department, the Customs Department and the Department for External Economic Ties were instructed to work out guidelines on tourist and non-official trips to Poland for 1992.

Republic Energy Situation Assessed

OW3010170491 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1220 GMT 30 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] First Deputy Energy Minister of Latvia Z. Blumbergis nas said in Riga that Latvia received 95 percent of all necessary energy resources from Russia and other republics of the former USSR. He noted that Latvia may have to borrow money and buy fuel abroad. In his words, "the gasoline crisis" in Latvia (sales of gasoline to private individuals stopped there a month ago) will continue in November. Mr. Blumbergis also said that talks with Finland on shipments of fuel will be held this week.

According to Director General of "Latvijas Nafta" ("Latvian Oil") I. Janson, this year Russia has shipped to Latvia 96,000 tons of gasoline less. [sentence as received]

A BF [BALTFAX] correspondent reports that currently Latvia has enough black oil for 25 days. Gas reserves will run out in April of 1992. Provision with liquefied gas is only 80 percent against last year.

This year Latvia has concluded 18 agreements on shipments of coal. Poland refused to sell coal for rubles charging $40 per ton of not assorted coal and $70 per ton of assorted coal.

The BF correspondent says in the coming winter Latvia will have no problem with firewood only.

Lithuania

Landsbergis on War Crime Suspects Issue

LD3010220991 Vilnius Radio Vilnius Network in Lithuanian 0700 GMT 29 Oct 91

[Text] As we have already informed you, Lithuanian Supreme Council Chairman Vytautas Landsbergis has received Afraim Zuroff, director of the Israeli branch of the Wiesenthal center. During the conversation they dwelt on various aspects of the rehabilitation process which is taking place in Lithuania. The Supreme Council representative for the press, Audrius Azubalis, has supplied the following information about the meeting:

Vytautas Landsbergis expressed his belief that the law and order institutions of the Republic of Lithuania, following the practice acknowledged by the international community, will cooperate with the state (?councils) of foreign countries investigating crimes against humanity during the Second World War, and that persons who have committed these crimes will not be rehabilitated and their criminal activity will be evaluated accordingly.

Afraim Zuroff was asked to define more precisely his and the Wiesenthal Center stand on the generalizations appearing in the foreign press, which are sometimes based on the opinion of this public organization, to the effect that, allegedly, the Lithuanian nation or Lithuania are to blame for the fact that during the Second World War genocide of the Jews took place on the Lithuanian territory occupied by the Nazis.

Zuroff avoided this question. Apart from that, the representative of the Wiesenthal Center stressed the stand—which is incorrect from the legal point of view—that the suspects should themselves prove their innocence.

In reply to Zuroff demand that the lists of all rehabilitated perosns be published, it was pointed out that this cannot take place in an atmosphere of suspicion and collective accusation. Specific material about crimes against humanity or genocide will be investigated and criminal proceedings will be instituted against persons linked with it.

Deputy Discusses Removal of KGB Documents

OW3110044691 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1445 GMT 30 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] At a session of the Lithuanian parliament on October 29th, deputy Jurgis Jurgelis made a statement revealing the secret removal of documents from the former KGB building in Vilnius. He announced names of the State Security and Home Defense Departments' servicemen who carried out that secret operation on September 5th and 16th. Mr. Jurgelis pointed out that none of the official organizations except the Prosecutor's Office has inquired about the information on the theft collected by him.

Two weeks ago, Mr. Jurgelis made a similar statement, but without indicating the names. The Lithuanian Prosecutor's Office has already launched investigation into the case.

At a press conference in Vilnius October 28th, members of the parliamentary commission investigating the KGB's activities Algirdas Endriukaitis and Saulius Peceliunas denied reports on the operation in the Lithuanian press. However, they refused to comment on the first statement of Mr. Jurgelis, saying that it is "the Prosecutor's Office's matter."

After the second statement by Mr. Jurgelis, the Lithuanian parliament decided to hear reports of Home Defense Minister Audrius Butkevicius and General Director of the State Security Department, Vice Premier Zigmas Vaisvila concerning the guarding of the KGB's documents. Their two ministries are now engaged in guarding the KGB building.

Defense Minister Views Insuring Security

LD3010215691 Vilnius Radio Vilnius International Service in Lithuanian 2200 GMT 28 Oct 91

[Text] Having returned from Madrid and Brussels where he took part in the North Atlantic parliamentary assembly session and met NATO leaders, Minister of National Defense Audrius Butkevicius, said that Lithuania's integration into the West European security systems may insure the country's security. In his opinion, the North Atlantic parliamentary assembly is such a system. Lithuania's associate membership, in the minister's opinion, will enable it to take part in general programs and help resolve rather complex conflicts.

Replying to a question from a Lithuanian TV correspondent about his meeting with NATO Secretary General Manfred Woerner, Audrius Butkevicius would only say that the conversation was uncommonly businesslike.

Control of Ignalina Safety Equipment Sought

PM3010164991 Vilnius EKHO LITVY in Russian 22 Oct 91 p 1

["Telegram to USSR Minister of Internal Affairs Barannikov"—EKHO LITVY headline]

[Text] In connection with the transfer of security at the Ignalina AES [nuclear electric power station] under our jurisdiction, we request the simultaneous transfer to us of the weapons and vehicles belonging to the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs Internal Troops Military Unit 3416, documentation relating to the organization and performance of combat [boyevaya] service, the technical equipment for the AES's security, spare parts and supplies for them, communications equipment, measuring and operational hardware, personal protection equipment, and planning, technical, control, and operational documentation relating to the fire protection signal system. Being fully aware of the complexity of the task of ensuring security at the Ignalina AES which we are taking upon ourselves, we are counting on your support in resolving this question promptly.

[Signed] Vaisvila, deputy prime minister of the Republic of Lithuania

Saudargas Meets Polish Counterpart in Warsaw

LD3010122591 Vilnius Radio Vilnius International Service in Lithuanian 2200 GMT 29 Oct 91

[Text] An unexpected meeting took place in Warsaw today between the foreign ministers of Poland and Lithuania. At a news conference, the meeting was described as fruitful and necessary,

An invitation to meet issued by Krzystof Skubiszewski was earlier handed to Lithuania's Foreign Minister Algirdas Saudargas, during his brief stopover at Warsaw Airport when the latter was en route to London.

Today's extensive discussion resulted in many compromises. However, as pointed out by Algirdas Saudargas, certain areas of the future interstate declaration between Poland and Lithuania need to be further coordinated.

Krzystof Skubiszewski observed that in the interests of both states, it would be beneficial to extend the final term for assumption of Lithuanian citizenship beyond 3 November. Changing the division of Vilnius region and Vilnius [word indistinct] would not be expedient.

The Polish foreign minister stated that he will most likely visit Vilnius after 3 November.

At today's meeting, the Lithuanian side was represented by the First Deputy Foreign Minister Valdemaras Katkus; Halina Kobeckaite, general director of the Department for Ethnic Minorities; and Dainius Linevicius, acting Lithuanian charge d'affaires in Poland. [passage indistinct]

Procurator Interrogates Communist Official

OW3110021991 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1730 GMT 30 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Representative of the Lithuanian Procurator's Office, Juozas Gaudutis, told BF [BALTFAX] that ex-second secretary of the now banned Lithuanian Communist Party, Vladislav Shved, who is an outspoken opponent of the Lithuanian state system, is giving testimony at the Lithuanian Procurator's Office. He is answering questions concerning the events in Vilnius last January, when the assault of the TV centre by the military caused fatalities among civilians, and is also giving an account of the Lithuanian party's activity during the state coup last August.

On October 29, Deputy Shved turned up in the Lithuanian parliament where he had not been since last January. The chairman said in this connection that the former communist leader was awaited at the Procurator's Office, where his testimony was needed. With the Assistant Procurator-General, Vladislav Shved went to the Procurator's Office.

Mr. Gaudutis said that the Procurator's Office will make the conclusions about the involvement or non-involvement of former communist party leaders, including Vladislav Shved, in the January and August crimes after all the information is collected and sorted out. He said that the Procurator's Office may name those accused of the above-mentioned crimes in December.

Supreme Soviet

Filatov Invited To Run for Deputy Chairman

OW3010205591 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1930 GMT 30 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Sergey Filatov, secretary of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet Presidium, told IF [INTERFAX] that he was officially invited to run for first deputy chairman of the republican Supreme Soviet.

Khasbulatov News Conference After Election

Comments on Various Issues

LD3010152191 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1000 GMT 30 Oct 91

[Text] Journalists are inflaming national enmity in Russia, and Russian radio and television are simply demoralizing the country. This was stated by Ruslan Khasbulatov on 29 October during his first news conference in the Kremlin after his election to the post of chairman of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet. Khasbulatov also accused Mikhail Gorbachev and Anatoliy Lukyanov of inciting Russian autonomies against the leadership of the republic. The speaker of the Russian parliament commented laconically on the resignations of his deputies, Boris Isayev and Svetlana Goryacheva. They resigned in the belief that it was better to resign than not to resign.

Replying to a question on the possibility of a new putsch, Khasbulatov stated that such a possibility cannot be ruled out, especially during the period of implementing unpopular economic measures. Concluding the news conference, Khasbulatov shocked journalists to some extent when, to a question concerning the return of churches within the Kremlin to the Orthodox Church, he stated that a more topical question for Russian parliamentarians is how to remain in the Kremlin themselves.

Notes 'Monopoly on Power'

LD3010152291 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1204 GMT 30 Oct 91

[Excerpt] After Yeltsin has taken upon himself to carry out the duties of the prime minister and Ruslan Khasbulatov has been elected chairman of the Supreme Soviet, a number of publications and deputies' circles are expressing thoughts as to whether this will lead to a new monopoly on power and whether it is necessary to set up a specific parliamentary opposition. Here is what Ruslan Imranovich Khasbulatov has to say:

[Begin Khasbulatov recording] What do you mean by the opposition? It seems to me that it would be something of a theoretical nature, so to speak, to put the question in such a form. The opposition should emerge if there is something it can put itself in opposition to. The Supreme Soviet has its own approach to the solution of this issue, its own concept, and the president has a different concept. And some contradictions arise here It is necessary to settle them. Right here is all the opposition. Should we make up the opposition specially just because we are the parliament and there a president? It does not happen like this in life. We should not seek this. If there is partnership and cooperation, as we said yesterday, there is partnership and cooperation based on the fact that the resultant forces are in action. One of them is quite strong and authoritative—it is executive power. The other force is of no lesser authority—it is the legislative power. They should not seek any special opposition. They should be really professional. They should be professionals who are experts in their field. There is no doubt the opposition will emerge objectively, given that people who work in these structures of power have a desire for this. This is what I think. [end recording)

Resolution on Chechen-Ingush Elections Issued

PM3010164191 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 29 Oct 91 p 1

[Resolution signed by R.I. Khasbulatov, first deputy chairman of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet: "Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet Resolution On Holding Elections to the Supreme Organs of State Power in the Chechen-Ingush Republic"]

[Text] Taking into account the extremely complex sociopolitical situation in the Chechen-Ingush Republic and the illegality of the elections to the republic's supreme organs of state power scheduled for 27 October 1991, the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Supreme Soviet resolves:

1. That the elections to the supreme organs of state power in the Chechen-Ingush Republic scheduled for 27 October 1991 have no legal basis and their results cannot be recognized as legitimate.

2. That the Provisional Supreme Soviet of the Chechen-Ingush Republic, RSFSR and USSR people's deputies from the Chechen-Ingush Republic, and the social movements be instructed to prepare and implement a package of measures designed to ensure legal guarantees for the holding of elections to the republic's supreme organs of state power, and the participation of all citizens in these elections, regardless of their nationality, religion, sex, or affiliation to political parties and movements.

3. That the preparation and holding of elections to the supreme organs of state power in the Chechen-Ingush Republic be implemented on the basis of RSFSR and republic legislative acts currently in force.

4. That RSFSR people's deputies elected from the Chechen-Ingush Republic and the republic's entire deputies corps be instructed to help prepare and hold elections to the supreme organs of state power on a

constitutional and legal basis, with due consideration for preserving the republic's unity and integrity and guaranteeing sociopolitical accord and interethnic peace in the republic.

[Signed] R.I. Khasbulatov, first deputy chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet
Moscow, The RSFSR House of Soviets, 24 October 1991

Fifth Congress of People's Deputies

Congress of People's Deputies Proceedings

LD3110072891

[Editorial Report] Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian at 2017 GMT on 30 October carries a 117-minute editon of its regularly scheduled "Congress of Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, RSFSR, People's Deputies" program, including recorded highlights of the RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies session in Moscow on 30 October.

The program opens with RSFSR Supreme Soviet Chairman Ruslan Khasbulatov in the chair, proposing that Congress deputies finish work on the constitutional court that was started on 29 October. Deputy Mikhail Alekseyevich Mityukhov rises to ask the deputies to consider the constitutional court candidates and then reads names of candidates and brief career details.

At 2022 GMT, Khasbulatov explains that it is the constitutional court chairman's right to propose the candidates, adding that certain candidates will each be given five minutes at the rostrum to introduce themselves to the deputies.

Deputy Mikhail Aleksandrovich Fedotov, the first candidate, explains that he has been preoccupied with the problem of creating conditions for a free press all his life. Deputy Mironov asks Fedotov whether creating a constitutional court at this juncture, while Russia still operates under the constitution given it by Brezhnev, does not constitute a threat to democratic reform. Fedotov says the constitutional court must help create a new constitution.

At 2038 GMT, after deputies question two other candidates, Khasbulatov proposes that the session discuss the agenda. An unidentified deputy proposes that the question of a first deputy for Khasbulatov be settled; another unidentified deputy proposes that the work of the constitutional commission on drafting a new constitution be discussed; a third unidentified deputy proposes that there be a discussion of the concept for a new constitution. Khasbulatov says perhaps a couple of hours could be devoted during one day of the Congress to this subject.

At 2041 GMT, Khasbulatov's proposal is put to the vote and accepted, with 772 votes for, 27 against, and 24 abstaining. Khasbulatov then says that a calm approach is needed on this issue.

At 2044 GMT, a tellers' commission officer is called upon to read the results of the second round of the secret ballot for the constitutional court. The results are: G.Ye. Bystrov, 478 votes for and 300 against; A.L. Kononov, 470 for and 355 against; V.O. Luchin, 529 for and 301 against; Yu.P. Slobodchikov, 459 for and 363 against; M.A. Fedotov, 445 for and 393 against; V.K. Samigullin, 338 for and 457 against; and G.A. Gadzhiyev, 483 for and 324 against. It is then noted that Luchin has been elected member of the constitutional court.

At 2046 GMT, the deputies vote to approve the protocol of the tellers' commission. Khasbulatov says that since the constitutional court needs 12 members, he will use his constitutional right as chairman to propose the candidacies of Kononov, Fedotov, and Gadzhiyev. He then leads the deputies in a minute's silence in honor of the political victims of repression who died, before asking deputies to vote on the three candidates he proposed.

At 2048 GMT, the day's agenda is voted on and approved.

The secretariat chairman then reads some notices.

At 2054 GMT, the tellers' commission officer reads the results of the third round of voting by secret ballot for members of the RSFSR constitutional court. The results are: Kononov: 535 for and 314 against; Fedotov: 504 for and 369 against; and Gadzhiyev: 635 for and 11 against. It is then noted that Kononov and Gadzhiyev are elected members. The tellers' commission report is then approved.

Khasbulatov says that concludes the election, since there are now 13 members of the constitutional court.

At 2056 GMT, a video caption indicates that the program will continue after the regularly scheduled 2100 GMT "Vesti" newscast.

At 2132 GMT, the program resumes with the new Russian constitutional court judges taking their oath and resigning as Russian people's deputies. The Congress then votes to affirm them as judges and accept their resignations as deputies.

At 2151 GMT, Deputy Mikhail (Mityukov) delivers a report on proposed amendments to the RSFSR constitution. He says that obstacles to land reform must be removed and that the Supreme Soviet must be transformed into a vigorous and effective legislature. The president's new status must be enshrined in the constitution, he stresses, adding that certain references to "socialist competition" must be expunged from the constitution. He then lists proposals for amending the 26 articles he finds need amending. Deputies then question (Mityukov) on land reform, the proposed size of the two houses of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, obsolete references in the constitution to other republics, and other issues.

At 2218 GMT, Sergey Shakhray, RSFSR presidential adviser, comes to the lectern to introduce two draft decisions from the RSFSR president. The first is on legal backup for economic reform. Only the congress can sanction the repeal of USSR laws on Russian territory, Shakhray says. The president requests that legislative initiatives on budgetary and other strategic matters be cleared with executive authority at the drafting stage, he points out, adding that the Supreme Soviet could halt a presidential decree as long as it acted within the stipulated time limit. The second decision deals with executive authority during implementation of economic reform. Elections for executive authorities should be suspended for one year, Shakhray reports.

At 2232 GMT, debate on the presidential proposals begins. An unidentified deputy says these are radical ideas which will completely change the arrangements currently in force. Executive powers will come to dominate the legislature completely, he warns, adding that it even calls into question the functions of the congress itself.

At 2237 GMT, Deputy Kuznetsov says that the legislature has allowed the executive authorities too much impunity and that an inspection system should be set up whereby the legislature would examine how its decisions are implemented. He laments that culture and education are poorly served under present circumstances.

At 2243 GMT, Deputy Galishnikov says the Russian Internal Affairs Ministry is short-staffed.

At 2247 GMT, Deputy Valentin Fedorov says the best way to change the old system is through a gradual annual reduction in state orders. The southern Kurils are ours and will remain so, he stresses.

At 2250 GMT, the program ends.

Yeltsin Appeal for More Power, Election Ban

LD3010170191 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1532 GMT 30 Oct 91

[by TASS legislative correspondent Vladimir Isachenkov]

[Text] Moscow, 30 Oct (TASS)—Russian President Boris Yeltsin has appealed to the RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies to expand his powers in regulating the economic reform through legislation and to ban all elections in the republic for a year.

In the appeal, circulated at the Congress today, Boris Yeltsin emphasized that Russia's executive power must be "appropriate for today's extreme situation" and for the aims of the economic reform.

Attached to the appeal is a draft Congress resolution on the organization of executive power during the period of radical economic reform. It envisages a ban on holding elections to state bodies and the suspension of elections of heads of local administration until 1 December 1992, and gives the president of Russia the right to determine himself the structure of the republic's supreme bodies of executive power and to form executive authorities at local level.

In accordance with the draft of another resolution, which was also given to the deputies today, bills on financial, taxation, banking and other compulsory issues of the economic reform should be agreed by the president or be presented to the parliament on his behalf. It is also envisaged that the president will be authorized to issue decrees for compulsory execution even if they formally contradict Union and Russian laws.

As a counterbalance, the right of the Russian Supreme Soviet to suspend such a decree within a week is envisaged. In such a case it should be considered at a legislative session within one week.

The essence of the transitional period, the document notes, is to create a rigid vertical administrative structure which establishes minimum necessary rules for economic and social behavior.

Draft resolutions will be discussed within the framework of a discussion on the socioeconomic situation in the republic, which will start this afternoon.

Further on Appeal, Aims

LD3010182691 Moscow TASS in English 1256 GMT 30 Oct 91

[By TASS legislative correspondent Vladimir Isachenkov]

[Text] Moscow October 30 TASS—Russia's President Boris Yeltsin has called on the Congress of Russian People's Deputies to grant him greater powers to regulate the country's economic reform and suspend all elections in the republic for a year.

In his address circulated among congress participants today Yeltsin stressed that Russia's executive power must be "adequate for today's extreme situation" and be consistent with the economic reform aims.

Along with Yeltsin's address, a Congress draft resolution was distributed setting out a plan for the organization of the executive power for the period of radical economic reform. It proposes a ban on elections to state bodies and a suspension of elections for local government until December 1, 1992 and grants the Russian president the right to determine himself the structure of the supreme bodies of executive power in the Republic and form local executive authorities.

Another draft resolution, also circulated at the Congress today, says all bills on finance, taxes, banking and other aspects of the economic reform are subject to mandatory coordination with the president or should be submitted to parliament on his behalf.

In addition, the president is expected to be granted the right to issue binding decrees, even if formally they are at variance with laws of the USSR or Russia.

As a counterbalance, the Russian parliament will get the right to suspend such decrees within a week after considering them in parliament session within the first week after any such decree is made.

The transitional period, the document notes, aims to create a rigid administrative hierarchy to establish the minimum necessary code of economic and social behaviour.

The draft resolutions will be considered within the framework of the debate about the social and economic situation in the Republic which is due to begin this afternoon.

Khasbulatov To Resolve Interethnic Problems

LD3010202191 Moscow TASS in English 1618 GMT 30 Oct 91

[By TASS legislative correspondent Ivan Ivanov]

[Text] Moscow October 30 TASS—Newly elected Russian parliamentary leader Ruslan Khasbulatov on Wednesday [30 October] said "I will do everything possible to carefully and gradually resolve inter-ethnic problems in Russia."

In his address to parliamentary leaders of former autonomous republics within Russia, who gathered in the Kremlin between the morning and the evening sessions of the Congress of Russian People's Deputies, Khasbulatov stressed inter-ethnic conflicts in Russia are provoked by social and economic problems.

He proposed a constitutional amendment making parliamentary speakers of former autonomous republics deputies to the post of chairman of the Russian Parliament.

The Congress has adopted a draft resolution "On the Integrity and Indivisibility of the Russian Federation and All Subjects of the Federation" announcing that "the Russian Federation is a sovereign, single and integral federative state of voluntarily united nation states, national-territorial and administrative-territorial subjects."

The resolution stresses the need to include into a federative treaty and a new Russian Constitution the principle "of integrity and indivisibility of the Russian Federation and all subjects of the Federation" and the mechanism for separating powers between them and federal bodies of power.

"The resolution urges the Russian Legislature to adopt by the end of 1991 a law "protecting Russian society from the growing inter-ethnic hatred and conflicts."

Draft Amendments to Constitution Presented

OW3010175091 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1500 GMT 30 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The deputy chairman of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet committee for legislation, Mikhail Mitelkov, who presented draft amendments to the RSFSR constitution to the Republican Congress of People's Deputies on Wednesday [30 October], has said that the draft is aimed in the first place at removing obstacles to the land reform and help turn the republican parliament into a strong professional legislature.

Mitelkov says that the constitution must put on record some of the amendments already made to the state structure of republics within the RSFSR.

The suggested amendments concern 6 articles. A ban on the sale of plots of land for a certain period of time is going to be lifted. The ideas of socialist emulation and of building a socialist society are likely to be scrapped, too.

More on Amendments

LD3010184991 Moscow TASS in English 1539 GMT 30 Oct 91

[By TASS legislative correspondent Gennadiy Talalayev]

[Text] Moscow October 30 TASS—The Congress of Russian People's Deputies today began the discussion of a draft law on amendments to the Russian Constitution.

The law covers 26 articles of the fundamental law. Two articles of the current constitution will be excluded, and two new articles will be introduced.

These amendments were primarily provoked by economic and political reforms. The introduction of the institute of Russian president also requires some new constitutional norms, aimed to crown the formation of a harmonious system of executive power at all levels of the Russian state organisation.

The consideration of all the planned changes and their versions will require a certain period of time. Thus, the deputies decided to stop the discussion for a while, and pass over to the next item on the agenda—"On Social and Economic Situation in the USSR."

Certainly, the deputies will focus on a specific program of radical reforms, put forward by Boris Yeltsin in his address to the Congress on October 28.

Alternative Bill Submitted

OW3110012091 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1715 GMT 30 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] At the Wednesday [30 October] discussion of the bill on amendments to the Russian Constitution, the Deputy Leonid Volkov who represents the constitutional commission submitted an alternative bill.

In his opinion, the alternative bill anchors a different makeup for a standing Russian parliament that gives each of the parliamentarians equal rights. In accordance with the constituent commission's bill, the entire RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Congress of People's Deputies becomes a standing republican parliament.

The number of parliamentarians on the RSFSR Supreme Soviet's Council of the Republic is brought to 900. That chamber meets four times a year. Attendance at sittings will not be mandatory, and a voting schedule may be worked out to secure a quorum on voting days.

Yeltsin's Economic Reform Package Critiqued

LD3010202991 Moscow TASS in English 1653 GMT 30 Oct 91

[By TASS legislative correspondent Lyudmila Aleksandrova]

[Text] Moscow October 30 TASS—Participants and guests of the 5th Congress of People's Deputies working for a third day in the Kremlin, assess possible consequences of the radical economic reforms proposed by Russian President Boris Yeltsin, in different ways.

Their opinions vary a great deal on the Russian president's prognosis saying that following liberalisation of prices "everything will become worse for only six months" and after that things will get better and prices will gradually stabilise.

According to one of the authors of the reform programme, Petr Filippov, financial stabilisation alone will promote improvement in the economic situation of Russia, even without necessary structural changes. "At the same time liberalisation of prices not supported by resolute measures on demonopolisation, will give no results other than a permanent increase in prices and wages. Measures on financial stabilisation should be accompanied by certain steps towards privatisation and commercialisation of state enterprises," Filippov told TASS.

"Contrary to common opinion, liberalisation of prices will not necessarily mean their actual rise. When free prices are introduced in the state trade they will be higher but at the same time it will bring about a drop in market prices. Goods will appear in state shops 'literally in two weeks' and it will do damage to speculators and second-hand dealers," said Filippov.

The former chairman of the higher economic council of Russia, People's Deputy of the USSR Mikhail Bocharov assessed the possibility of such quick financial stabilisation very sceptically.

"The time allotted for execution of the reforms is unrealistic. If we are talking about liberalisation of prices then it is necessary to consider several variants: what we shall have in a month, two and three months, and what measures should be taken at every stage. I have a feeling that such variants have not been calculated," Bocharov told TASS.

A political opponent of the Russian leadership and former central committee secretary of the Russian Communist Party Gennadiy Zyuganov also considers unreal promises to stabilise the economic situation in Russia within six months. "For example, the cattle stock in Russia has fallen by 15 per cent and it will take us at least 5 years to restore it to its former level. The situation with industrial goods is no better," Zyuganov pointed out.

In the opinion of a representative of the Russian Communist Party leadership, reforms should be made in a different way. "We must not free prices while shop shelves are empty. It is necessary to retain firm prices for certain goods to ensure a minimum living wage level," he said.

Further Reactions

LD3010212891 Moscow TASS in English 2106 GMT 30 Oct 91

[Text] Moscow October 30 TASS—Last Monday's speech of Russian President Yeltsin at the Fifth Extraordinary Congress of Russian People's Deputies, in which he presented a program of radical economic reforms in the republic, remains in the focus of public attention. Printed editions, radio and television continue their comments.

People's Deputy of the Russian Federation and the USSR Yuriy Afanasyev considers "substantiated" Yeltsin's intention to personally head the government. "Something like national unity should be provided in this time of trial in Russia," Afanasyev told the VECHERNAYA MOSKVA newspaper.

"Yeltsin's decision to head the government is a step of a person who burns the bridges," Russian Minister of Press and Information Mikhail Poltoranin said. "The government should have authority. One cannot find a premier now, whom people would believe so much as they believe Yeltsin."

in the opinion of Soviet businessman and deputy Mikhail Bocharov, the Russian president left "unclear" such items as "wages and salaries, the budget, the defence complex, foreign economic activities, and, finally, the protection of domestic market."

Chairman of the Byelorussian Supreme Soviet Stanislav Shushkevich is convinced that no changes in the stand of the Russian president have happened, his aim remains the same—it is the market. However, in his opinion, "conditions are different" in Russia and Byelorussia, "that is why we show restraint in the transition to the market."

"Free prices are necessary. However, it is impossible to set prices free in one republic, even in such a big one as the Russian Federation. It will bring negative consequences for all the republics because of the integration of our economy," deputy Tajik Prime Minister Abduzhalil Samadov told the IZVESTIYA newspaper.

"One thing in Yeltsin's speech confused me," Estonian Minister of Finance Rein Miller told IZVESTIYA.

"I mean his statement that russia will trade with former Soviet republics, which did not sign the economic agreement, at world prices and with hard currency. But at the sixth Tallinn meeting of head of governments and representatives of republics, a Russian representative signed a declaration, which says the following: In 1992 the common currency for all states, regardless of their status, will be the rouble."

Russian Constitutional Court Judges Sworn In

LD3010214291 Moscow TASS in English
1232 GMT 30 Oct 91

[By TASS legislative correspondent Tamara Zamyatina]

[Text] Moscow October 30 TASS—Constitutional court judges were sworn in today at the Fifth Congress of Russia's People's Deputies. This rounded off the formation of the constitutional court of the Russian Federation. Having elected 10 judges during yesterday's evening session, the Congress endorsed three more candidatures during today's morning meeting. Two seats have remained vacant. They will be filled at the next Congress.

Now the Russian Constitutional Court, whose members have been elected for life, is prepared to discharge its duties: to pass verdicts on the compliance of legislative acts and actions by officials with the basic law of Russia. If the Constitutional Court finds the Russian president's actions to be unconstitutional, it has the right to impeach him.

The Congress has endorsed the composition of the Russian Constitutional Court and accepted the resignation of the elected judges from the parliament.

In reply to the motion of several deputies, the Congress decided to discuss the work of the Russian Constitutional Commission, which has drafted a new Russian constitution, and to include this item in its agenda. It was initially planned to discuss the draft at the current Congress, but most of the deputies did not agree to this proposal.

Liberal Democrat Zhirinoskiy Predicts 'Chaos'

OW3010182991 Moscow INTERFAX in English
1715 GMT 30 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] "By next Easter a new regime will be established in this country. It will cut short the neo-Bolshevik rule," said on Wednesday [30 October] Chairman of the USSR Liberal Democratic Party Vladimir Zhirinovskiy.

He claimed at a Moscow press-conference that Boris Yeltsin's address to the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Congress of People's Deputies had been his "swan song: following it, all Yeltsin can do is repeat himself."

Zhirinovskiy predicts that by next autumn the country will be in the grip of chaos, hunger and unemployment. "The only solution will be for us to be elected to top posts in the country," said the party's leader who urged freezing prices and setting minimum and maximum wages immediately.

Zhirinovskiy pledged to stop the parade of sovereignties, to withdraw "the Russian troops" out of the Transcaucasia and to stop "squandering the Russian territory." According to him, in response to Japan's claim to some of the Kuril islands, "we will raise the question of making the island Hokkaido part of the Sakhalin region." Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania will not be independent for longer than 6 to 7 months, said Zhirinovskiy and added that "we are ready to give to Estonia the Pskov region it claims. But in this case Estonia will have 0.9 mn [million] Estonians and 1.5 mn Russians, which will decide any referendum in our favour."

Asked about IF's [INTERFAX] attitude toward the Ukraine's sovereignty declaration, Zhirinovskiy said that he would like to see the Russians, Belorussians and Ukrainians have "invariably brotherly relations." However, if the Ukraine makes up its mind to "go to extremes," it will be forced to cede parts of its territory to Russia, Germany and Poland. "Then war is inevitable, and at that moment we'll come to the rescue of our Slav brothers," emphasized the party's leader.

Rutskoy Says Party Activities 'Illegal'

OW3110003191 Moscow INTERFAX in English
1930 GMT 30 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] On Friday [25 October] the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] People's Deputy Valeriy Shuikov said to the Congress that Russian Vice-President Aleksandr Rutskoy party activities were illegal. The deputy argued that Rutskoy must step down as leader of the party Free Russia.

Official on Rumor To Suspend Activities

OW3010184891 Moscow INTERFAX in English
1715 GMT 30 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] State Councillor Sergey Shakhray told IF

[INTERFAX] that he "knew nothing about work on the document" on suspending the activities of the Congress of the RSFSR's People's Deputies for the period of transition.

Such rumours are circulating in the corridors, which is probably connected with the address Boris Yeltsin made on Wednesday [30 October] in which he discussed the organisation of executive power in the republic during the transitional period.

Federation Affairs

Yeltsin Meeting With Faction Heads Described

PM2310104991 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 22 Oct 91 p 2

[Report on meeting with Sergey Yushenkov, leader of the "Radical Democrats" faction, by Aleksandr Linkov; place, date not given: "The Representatives of the Political Factions Were Firm. The President Was Restrained and Attentive"]

[Text] President Boris Yeltsin met with the leaders of parliamentary groups and factions. A frank discussion went on for over an hour and a half. Our correspondent met with Sergey Yushenkov, leader of the "Radical Democrats" faction (ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA introduced this faction on the pages of its 11 October 1991 edition), and asked him to give us an account of the talks which took place.

[Yushenkov] At the meeting, Boris Nikolayevich talked about the decision he made to submit a draft law on the global reform of judicial authority to the Supreme Soviet within the next two weeks. Just before our meeting began he returned from the First Congress of Russian People's Judges and concluded that there is a need to align all power structures—including judicial authority.

He recounted his meeting with Mikhail Gorbachev regarding the conclusion of the economic agreement. He noted that he had managed to defend the version adopted by the Russian Supreme Soviet, but Boris Nikolayevich pointed out that this was done with difficulty.

The president went on to consider the difficulties in implementing the reforms, exonerating neither himself nor the Supreme Soviet. The center which they had constantly fought in the past no longer exists. Therefore, the president sees the solution to economic problems, for example, in the liberalization of prices and wages. This is the key area if you like. Monetary reform supplements this insofar as intervention by individual states is beginning. What is envisaged is ruble intervention. In order to implement the given reforms it is necessary to set up vertical structures of executive power. Proceeding from this the president insists that elections for administration heads must be postponed.

Those who attended the meeting complained to Boris Nikolayevich about the work of the presidential apparatus organization, the indecisiveness of executive power in conducting reforms, and about other things.

The president did not start answering individual questions, saying that he had heard many points of interest and that he needed time to think about the proposals and ideas expressed at the meeting.

I asked several questions. For example, I asked about the need to submit to the Supreme Soviet a draft law on defending Russian state sovereignty which would provide for all the attributes of statehood, including our own monetary unit. In my view, this was met with understanding.

I touched upon army problems. At the moment the army must not be cut back so drastically nor may we yield to Landsbergis' ultimatums that troops be withdrawn from Lithuanian territory by 1 January 1992. I made some critical observatioon about apparatus chief Yuriy Petrov, who, while working in Cuba, waged a slander campaign against Yeltsin and was not averse to persecuting colleagues who merely sympathized with Boris Nikolayevich.

Other viewpoints were heard. For example, Sergey Baburin once again promoted the idea of a Greater Russia. Candidates for the post of prime minister were proposed. In particular, we proposed Shumeyko, Ispravnikov, and Nikolay Fedorov. Other names were forwarded: Saburov, Svyatoslav Fedorov. The president did not name a single contender.

Boris Nikolayevich agreed with my comment on the fact that the time has come for active mediatory missions to settle conflicts not just in Nagorno-Karabakh or Yugoslavia but above all in Chechen-Ingushetia, Ossetia, and Tatarstan; that is, in Russia.

On the whole, the 90 minute conversation was rich in content. Its tone was set by People's Deputy Viktor Sheynis who, following correct procedure, expounded all our criticisms of the president. It must be noted that Boris Nikolayevich was good natured and understanding in accepting the deputies' criticisms.

I have had occasion to participate in two meetings with Yeltsin: the latest one and the one where he talked with representatives from the coordination council of "Democratic Russia." In my view, that meeting was more productive. It was a kind of feeler, an attempt to break through the wall surrounding Boris Nikolayevich. At that time, Yuriy Nikolayevich Afanasyev initiated a serious discussion, immediately establishing a very high criterion for the problems to be discussed. The meeting turned out to be more trenchant, certainly, but also more productive. It got practical results. It was then that we refused to agree that the president needs to resort to the right of veto on the Law on Electing Administration Heads, and persuaded him simply to appeal to the

Supreme Soviet. It can be said that the president heeded what we had to say. Unfortunately, the parliament did not profit by this.

Should the president hold more frequent meetings not just with faction leaders and chairmen of committees and commissions, but also simply with the deputies? In my view, he needs to come to the Supreme Soviet. I mentioned this to him, but as Boris Nikolayevich explained, he is preparing a major report with a detailed analysis. The president intends to deliver it at the Congress of Russian People's Deputies and thus considers it inexpedient to talk about the existing situation twice in a row. I repeat that I am convinced that a meeting between Boris Nikolayevich and the Supreme Soviet deputies before the congress would not be out of line.

Khasbulatov Interviewed on Current Issues

LD2510175791 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 1930 GMT 24 Oct 91

[Interview with Ruslan Khasbulatov, acting chairman of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, RSFSR, Supreme Soviet, by correspondent Sergey Torchinskiy; place, date not given: "Ruslan Khasbulatov: Our Goal is Agreement"—live or recorded]

[Excerpts] [Khasbulatov] I was given some statistical data today. About 90 million tonnes of grain crops will be collected this year, while during the years of the 12th five-year plan 104 million tonnes were collected. Last year it was 116 million tonnes, and you know it was far from the most favorable year. This year it is 90 million tonnes. You can see an immediate reduction of nearly 27 [as heard] million tonnes. The yield of grain crops has fallen sharply. According to estimates, it will amount to 14.5 centner per hectare; last year it was 18.5 centners. On the whole the indices are simply disastrous. Cattle, poultry, and milk purchases have been reduced by 13 percent during this period and egg purchases by 7 percent.

On the whole, all this proves that regarding the economic situation and the provision of the population, we will have a very complicated and difficult year—a very difficult year. Ryazan, Voronezh, Lipetsk, Tambov, Penza, and Saratov Oblasts, the Maritime Kray, and Mordovskaya and Gorno-Altayskaya Republics have had the worst reductions in volume of production and in sales of milk and the productivity of cows. On the whole, no matter what index in the field of the agro-industrial complex is taken, these production indices have been significantly reduced everywhere compared to last year. I would like to remind you that we passed a law on priority provision of the agro-industrial complex with material and technical resources. Moreover, in line with this law a special regime was envisaged for providing the agro-industrial complex so there is a complete failure to observe this regime. For example, in the first nine months the RSFSR Ministry of Agriculture and Food did not receive 244,000 tonnes of diesel fuel, 62,000 tonnes of furnace fuel oil, 15,000 tonnes of diesel oils, and about 50,000 tonnes of household oven fuel. No motor vehicle gasoline at all was delivered to farms in 23 oblasts and krays of the Republic, no diesel fuel to 33 oblasts, and no diesel oils to 27 krays and oblasts. In this respect, of course, we are expecting very serious and decisive action in the matter of reforming not just the agro-industrial complex, but indeed the entire economy. [passage omitted]

The implementation of the program for the social development of the countryside has in practice been undermined completely. Everyone had been pleased when we were adopting the fairly well balanced program for the integrated development of agriculture. The program for the social development of the countryside was in fact dealt with there. Is that not so? It has practically been undermined. The plan for roads has not been fulfilled, for instance; I will not cite the many statistics. Measures to bring gas to the countryside have also been completely undermined.

In agriculture, generally speaking, we have very major failures, and in my view these failures are also caused by subjective factors to a large extent. There is the sluggishness of the government and of Minselkhozprod [Ministry of Agriculture and Food Products], and also the fact that we didn't deal with the collective and state farms very seriously. We do not want to smash the collective and state farms overnight. If we smash them, we will not create either smallholdings or peasant holdings and will naturally undermine the basis of farms—the collective and state farms. Of course, there had to be and has to be a very flexible approach: perhaps a gradual transformation of these collective and state farms so that as the holders of this standardized equipment and this experience, and with their large and experienced collectives, they can really disband into some sort of genuinely cooperative enterprises. That is one thing. Naturally, there must also be incentives to enable them to feel they are the owners of these farms.

[Torchinsiy] The important thing is that they would find it advantageous to transform themselves.

[Khasbulatov] They must find it advantageous; they must have an incentive. Yes, they must seek this themselves.

[Torchinskiy] There is one single condition. The collective and state farm and the small farmer must be free producers of goods. They must have control of their goods and prices for them.

[Khasbulatov] Quite so and they must serve the market. Generally speaking, reform still needs to be carried out here. We all very much hope that Boris Nikolayevich, our president, will speak at the Congress and propose a whole range of measures, serious and radical reforms, intensifying the reforming activity of the Russian parliament. Of course, we must have a government of national confidence with a leader enjoying people's respect and recognition. There is no doubt that there are reforms ahead that will not be particularly popular among the population. Circumstances are now forcing us into this. If a year ago we could still say that we would try to implement our reforms without a deterioration in people's standard of living, reality is now bringing us face to face with a deterioration in people's standard of living, and we are not in a position to halt these processes. Moreover, we have lost quite a lot of time—practically three months. Throughout August, September, and October the government has not shown itself to be a serious executive force capable of implementing at least the laws adopted by the Russian parliament. They may not be all that perfect, but if even those laws that there are had been put into effect and implemented along the vertical chain of administrative command, they would already have yielded certain results, both in terms of intensifying reform and improving people's standard of living.

[Torchinskiy] How reliable is this chain of command?

[Khasbulatov] This circumstance does worry us a great deal, and I know that it worries the president too, so it is not by chance that last year the president presented the idea of it not being in our interest to postpone the elections nor to limit ourselves to appointing the executive bodies for only one year. This was done by means of presidential decrees this year.

You know that at the Supreme Soviet we had very serious discussions on this, and generally speaking, the majority of deputies consider that postponing them until next year could worsen the situation even further.

[Torchinskiy] On the other hand, the president is asking the Supreme Soviet to assume a certain responsibility, and it seems to me that he does not have the right to do that.

[Khasbulatov] But that is just what he is assuming—a considerable responsibility in proposing that the Supreme Soviet implement these sorts of resolutions connected with giving the president the right to appoint the executive bodies himself, in particular, the heads of the local administration—let us say, the chairman of the executive authorities in the oblasts and krays. You must see that the Supreme Soviet might have its own outline of some description, its own arguments. Is that not right? That is what has actually happened at the Supreme Soviet. About what are the deputies dissatisfied? They are dissatisfied about the fact that certain rights have been exceeded, so therefore the Supreme Soviet...

[Torchinskiy, interrupting] But the president is making a request.

[Khasbulatov] Yes, a request is being made. I supported adopting this, but the rights of deputies are also of some significance, are they not? A deputy has the right to either agree or disagree.

[Torchinskiy] On that evening, a situation arose where no one wanted to step down on a matter of principle.

[Khasbulatov] No, I do not consider that it is such a major issue, and on the whole I do not understand why so much significance is being attached to this particular incident. The problem of authority does not lie here, nor does the problem of all economic reforms lie here. Are you really saying that the Supreme Soviet should be given the chance to resolve this problem, and do you really suppose that if this happens these problems which we have been discussing will be resolved instantaneously? This is not the main thing here. It is not by chance that I started with our most acute and urgent problems over foodstuffs and the agricultural sector. The most important thing now, both for the Supreme Soviet—for the president and for the government, too—is to make determined moves in the sphere of the economic reform of the whole of society, the whole of the state, which is what we have not been doing. [passage omitted]

What we most urgently need now is a program of practical actions for the government and for the president. We have needed it for three months already. We are already wasting time, have already wasted all this time. How much longer can we wait? This is what deputies say. [passage omitted]

Take the ethnic issues. This is yet another of those extremely serious obstacles to our progress. For example, as you know, the situation in Checheno-Ingush is very complex. Without any legal base, a group of armed individuals attempts to seize power there. They have already announced presidential elections, although it is clear that those elections are totally illegal. Well you know, both the statement issued by the presidium of the Supreme Soviet, and the Supreme Soviet resolution—talk about this. Vice President Rutskoy talked to them; I was there and seemed to calm the people—they promised to disperse—but the moment I left, the unrest started again. This is indeed our common trouble. This is the tension, primarily, in our economic situation, in the socioeconomic situation. The people have no confidence about their situation today. This is why I always start every discussion from the economic issues not because I am an economist. [passage omitted]

You know that the situation in North Ossetia has become very serious. Why do I want to talk about North Ossetia, though admittedly from the outside it still seems to be Georgia? The thing is that almost 78,000 refugees have now moved to our North Ossetia. Naturally, in many cases, they are settling in the areas to which Ingushetia has been laying claim. In other words, the conflict is becoming artificial.

The situation in Dagestan is still tense. Today trains have finally started running, with some difficulty, and suddenly citizens came out again and blockaded traffic to the Transcaucasus. In our other republics, you know, the situation is still tense. This distracts us as well, taking a lot of our energy. Therefore I would like to use this occasion to call on our citizens, including those in ethnic republics and in Checheno-Ingush, to calm down, to become more vigilant, and not to succumb to provocations by militant people who suddenly decide to announce themselves as presidents. A legislative basis should be set up. The Supreme Soviet must be elected. After all, we recently adopted at the Supreme Soviet a decision, a special decision, to provide for the institution of presidency in the republics which are part of the RSFSR. We are not trying to obstruct them, but everything must be done legally, right? Naturally, it must be done legally. [passage omitted]

Presidential Order on Defense Counselor Noted

PM2410114491 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 24 Oct 91 First Edition p 1

["Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Presidential Order on the RSFSR State Counselor for Defense and His Service"—ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA headline]

[Text] The Regulations on the RSFSR State Counselor for Defense and His Service have been ratified by order of the RSFSR president.

The total number of personnel in the Service of the RSFSR state counselor for defense has been fixed at 35 people, including 20 servicemen, with a monthly wage fund of 50,300 rubles.

The RSFSR state counselor for defense, servicemen working in his Service, and their families retain the rights, benefits, and privileges (including the right to monetary compensation in lieu of food rations, an allowance for military rank, and a percentage seniority allowance) granted under current legislation to servicemen on active military service in the USSR Armed Forces and to their families.

The Administration of Affairs and the relevant subunits of the RSFSR president's administration are responsible for providing the Service of the RSFSR state counselor for defense with technical equipment and also for providing domestic and medical services for personnel.

K.I. Kobets, RSFSR state counselor for defense, has been tasked with forming the Service in accordance with the present order.

'Democratic Russia' Backs Yeltsin's Plans

LD2910145291 Moscow TASS in English 1331 GMT 29 Oct 91

[By TASS legislative correspondent Lyudmila Aleksandrova]

[Text] Moscow October 29 TASS—The "Democratic Russia" movement, formed a year ago on the basis of Boris Yeltsin's election bloc, is prepared to render unreserved support to Russia's president in his unpopular economic reforms, risking to lose the trust of the working people.

Members of the "Democratic Russia" Coordination Council told a briefing, held today during a recess in the work of the Congress of Russian People's Deputies, that it planned to set up public committees to back the reforms on the basis of the teams, formed by Yeltsin's supporters on the eve of the presidential elections.

"We are in a predicament, but we believe it is most important to be by the president's side, when he is about to embark upon the reforms that we have urged him to undertake," cochairman of the Coordination Council Lev Ponomarev told TASS. "Our task is to take the lead of the people before this is done by populist leaders, to convince the nation that there is no other way but to surmount the difficulties."

According to "Democratic Russia," all sociopolitical movements, parties, workers' unions and businessmen should be invited to take part in the committees, set up to back the reforms. The task of these committees is to "promptly fix the deadlines and ensure the implementation of the reforms, to overcome the resistance of economic and administrative bureaucracy, which is not prepared to effect anticrisis measures."

In addition to individual members, the "Democratic Russia" movement includes practically all the Russian parties of democratic orientation that existed in the republic in the autumn of 1990. The People's Party of Free Russia (the former Democratic Party of Russian Communists) and the Republican Party of the Russian Federation have also expressed unreserved support for the programme of radical reforms, outlined by Russia's president on Monday, which envisages several unpopular economic measures.

Hence, in reply to Yeltsin's Monday appeal, the foundation has already been laid for the creation of a bloc of political parties and public movements in support of the coming reforms.

Russian Parties To Back Yeltsin Reforms

LD3010203391 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1800 GMT 30 Oct 91

[Text] Leaders of the Republican Party of Russia, the Social Democrat Party, and the Free Russia People's Party have signed an agreement setting up a bloc in support of the course for radical economic reforms as announced by Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] President Boris Yeltsin on 28 October at the RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies. Deputy Vladimir Lisenko, one of the Republican Party leaders, in reporting this to the INTERFAX Agency said that a meeting is being planned between representatives of the new bloc and Sergey Stankevich, RSFSR state adviser on ties with political parties, public movements, and organizations.

Russian Trade Union Head Klochkov Interviewed

PM2910105591 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 26 Oct 91 p 3

[Report by Yekaterina Vasilchenko: "Thoughts at the Main Entrance"]

[Text] Picket line organized by the Federation of Independent Russian Trade Unions have been outside Russia's White House for three days. The demonstrators are demanding that the government make public a clear economic program not for the period through the year 2000, not for a five-year period but for the immediate future. Their main demand is that there should be "market wages for market prices."

Similar actions, only on a smaller scale, are now being carried out by the trade unions in many cities at the local authorities' "main entrances." We asked Igor Klochkov, chairman of the Federation of Independent Russian Trade Unions, to impart the thoughts which occurred to him during this vigil:

"The demonstration is part of the Russian trade unions' 21-26 October 'Unity of Actions Days.'

"Specifically, the picket lines near the White House were the result of the initial refusal of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet to adopt the law on indexing the population's incomes. If prices for all commodities are released from control that means that the price for manpower must also be released. Its determination should be the subject of a contract between the labor collectives and the administration and trade unions and in the budget-finance sector with the government."

Among people employed in hired labor (who form the majority in our country) you will hardly find even one person for whom the demands which have been voiced do not seem fair. Perhaps there are few people who would seriously hope that the trade union activists freezing outside the Russian parliament's main entrance will be able to change anything in the situation which has taken shape.

Klochkov himself tries not to lose his optimism:

"By a runoff vote parliament adopted the law on indexing. Unless our other demands are satisfied, on 13 November we shall urge all enterprises which do not have a continuous production process and which are not connected with vital services to stop work for an hour. If that does not work....[changes thought] We are working on a broader action. Then we shall demand the removal of the government, the recall of the deputies, and so forth. If the government does not listen to the trade unions now, it may find itself faced with mass popular demonstrations."

So it looks as though the trade unions are experimenting with the language of threats and beginning to organize popular demonstrations independently. Today their mass nature is ensured—trade union activists have come from the nearby oblasts to stand outside the White House and have flown in from Saratov, Samara, Severodvinsk, and Arkhangelsk, at trade union expense. They have not stinted: They are defending the people's interests and their own interests.

Igor Klochkov:

"It is a tense moment right now. Unorganized privatization is taking place in the country. The departments and party apparatus are dividing the people's property between themselves. We cannot tolerate that. We demand that we be included in the share-out."

Trade Union Leaders Warn of Confrontation

OW3010184591 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1715 GMT 30 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Kazbek Doev, leader of a parliamentary group of the Federation of Independent Russian Trade Unions, warned of a probable confrontation between the trade unions and the government in the course of the radical reform the Russian President Yeltsin had suggested. In an interview with IF [INTERFAX] Doev conceded the need for radical measures but promised trade union support only if wages of employees at state-owned enterprises rise at a minimum of 100

before the prices are liberalised. He estimated the number of Russians needing an early pay hike at 30 to 40 million.

According to Doev, the trade unions plan to seek a new agreement with the Russian government on social guarantees. They intend to insist on mandatory collective bargains between employees and management and on the formation of funds to pay severance benefits.

Burbulis Comments on 'Minefield of Power'

PM2810150991 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 28 Oct 91 Union Edition pp 1, 2

["Abbreviated transcript" of interview with Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, RSFSR, State Secretary Gennadiy Burbulis by unidentified "leading IZVESTIYA journalists"; interview conducted at IZVESTIYA editorial office on unspecified date: "The Minefield of Power...Conversation at IZVESTIYA Editorial Office With RSFSR State Secretary G.E. Burbulis"]

[Text] There is huge interest in everything that is taking place in the White House. The Fifth Congress of Russian People's Deputies, an event of exceptional importance for us all, is opening there 28 October.

No issue of any remotely serious paper can manage without analysis of political life and forecasts regarding Russia's future, which is being defined and laid down on the Krasnopresnenskaya Embankment. Often it is not only news that is carried, but also rumors, fantasies, and unlikely stories.

The wish to obtain firsthand information and to hear assessments of the most important recent events from one of Russia's policymakers were the main motives when we invited RSFSR State Secretary Gennadiy Burbulis to come to the editorial office. For three and a half hours in the chief editor's office, leading IZVESTIYA journalists put all sorts of questions to the state secretary. The conversation was useful, mutually useful we hope. We offer an abbreviated transcript of it for readers' attention today.

[IZVESTIYA] Please tell us, Gennadiy Eduardovich, what exactly is happening today inside the Russian leadership? On the eve of the Congress, on the eve of major reforms, this is now probably the most important question in political life. Many people, journalists included, do not understand these processes at the moment.

[Burbulis] The situation now is indeed unique. The attention on the deeds of Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin and the White House is so close and the wish to participate is so great that any hitches on our part—whether personal grievances or a surprising failure to match someone's expectations of us—immediately become the central issue of the moment.

My credo is this: Politics is the highest form of creativity; this is particularly evident today, in the situation that we have jointly created and are experiencing.

Both the conditions for the activity of the Russian leadership and the political environment in which Boris Nikolayevich, Ivan Stepanovich, and Ruslan Imranovich were operating changed substantially after the August events. Finally, the structures they head have also changed themselves. The dynamics of the processes that had made them group together have changed. Previously we were seeking consistent and unorthodox moves to breach the concrete wall of the totalitarian center. This was a historic task that inspired us and developed a certain solidarity, but now the real situation has changed. The center is on a road to nowhere, and it is necessary to answer the question: Just what are we actually doing? Of what do the practical efforts of Russia's supreme power consist?

In my view, the gravest legacy of the year is that we have been unable to form a government worthy of the name. The second point is this: Maybe we who elaborated the presidential concept in Russia are to blame for this, but we did not have the sense—and this is my fault to a large extent—to involve parliament in the elaboration of this concept from the very beginning. This was incorrect from the viewpoint of tactics, substance, and psychology. After all, it seemed unnatural to many people that the legislature, in the shape of the Supreme Soviet, had suddenly ceased to be coupled with the head of state. The president, as the organizer of state-political administration in the republic and at the same time the head of the executive, simply was not seen in his first capacity.

This was how we arrived at the idea of the State Council.

This was how we fell into the trap, if you like. First, over the course of a year the Council of Ministers had not acquired its own subject of activity, so to speak. It was forced to lock horns with the system rather than form proper executive structures with a clear program of aims, transformations, and reforms. Second, after our 12 June victory, we proved to be not very subtle tacticians in creating the principles of a presidential system in Russia. Third, we built up and flexed our "muscle" within one system, but after August we found we needed a totally different kind of "muscle." You know, it is a situation where you have been gathering speed and running, but the target you were intending to hit has vanished.

In addition, we celebrated the victory over the communist structure in a quite impermissible, romantic way. The exultation at the fact that this collapse was so swift was also impermissible because the poison concentrated within the system that we might call the "CPSU state" had spread everywhere and permeated every pore of our life. Just you take a look—where are, say, obkom [party oblast committee] secretaries now? Take any oblast, they are all either chairmen of executive committees at the rayon or city level or among the deputies of various leaders, even where there were never deputies before. We must realize that today we are faced with a revanchist program of a staggering kind.

Every cloud has a silver lining, admittedly. The more acute the situation is, the simpler the choice becomes. In this regard Boris Nikolayevich's two-week vacation had various motives: cumulative fatigue, a mental quirk of someone who needs emotional ups and downs as it were, and most important of all, an attempt to analyze the situation. It transpired, it finally became clear: We now have no time, absolutely none, for maneuvers, for any slippage, for lengthy stages. Our salvation lies in resolute reforms, primarily economic, management reforms.

As for the interrepublican treaty process, at least three heterogeneous entities are taking part in it. There are Russia and the few republics interested in reforms, and there are the same old communist regimes threatening to take a fundamentalist form, which do not want these reforms but want only to gain breathing space. Third, there is the ambiguous Union center, which is nothing other than the persona of the president of the Union today.

What have we found out for ourselves? We can embark on a fruitful treaty process only if we formulate the objective; Russia will be a nonstarter without full statehood and real independence. When I mentioned this at a meeting with deputies, saying that Russia is the legal successor to the Union and without adding that I was talking about structures on Russia's territory, without adding that I was talking about a kind of historical context of the Union itself, I was forced, as you know, to respond to assessments of this statement.

[IZVESTIYA] What was the problem here? Haste or jumping the gun? In general how do you envision Russian statehood?

[Burbulis] The question of Russian statehood is becoming the number one political issue, but we believe that the road to it is fundamentally different from that taken in the other republics. It is not the road of political debates in parliament or between the president and the corps of deputies—it is the road of real economic reforms, which must call for an appropriate system of power.

What do Russia's people want? A good life. How can this be achieved? Only via the resolute renewal of the economic management system. You may ask: Is this realistic? Yes, I would reply, when new management structures and the potential power of the presidential system have proved their worth.

At present big-league politics is coupled with the personal tastes, interests, and potential of the people who are involved in it, but unfortunately, we currently lack the "team" atmosphere that is created over the years and that molds certain internal rules of conduct. There is the very natural temptation of primary political popularity. There are the personal difficulties, understandable enough in human terms, associated with being in the shadow of such a striking and impressive figure as Boris Yeltsin. There is also the excellent ailment of democratic activeness.

Does this signify a crisis with no way out? Absolutely not, it seems to me. Yes, we are in the minefield of power, which we entered as soon as Yeltsin was elected chairman of Russia's Supreme Soviet. This means finding ourselves in various risky political situations. We had sufficient analytical abilities and sufficient forecasting talent to extricate ourselves from these situations over the course of a year. Now there are different "mines," and the government that we will now need is a "sapper government" that will certainly be blown up, but before that happens will be forced to travel a certain distance. At the moment there is nothing more important than professionals capable of resolving economic tasks.

[IZVESTIYA] What is your forecast regarding the development of relations with the Ukraine?

[Burbulis] A subtle but urgent task today is to overcome everything, both pride and perhaps a certain psychological awkwardness, and to embark without fail on direct talks with the Ukraine. In settling scores with the totalitarian system we cannot allow ourselves to forget that Russia and the Ukraine are not states "seeking" their independence, not states equal to all the rest. They are something 100 times greater—in terms of both history and their future.

[IZVESTIYA] As you will recall, at a certain moment people began to develop the feeling that Gorbachev's main shortcoming as a politician is that he is always late. Is that not the same impression now emerging regarding the Russian authorities?

[Burbulis] I would like you to try to put yourself in our place for a while.

A week after the coup, when it became clear that the former center was "on all fours," so to speak, it transpired that many people saw Russia, as it were, in the old image—the imperial image. To some extent this image prompted all the independence decisions. I stress that the reaction to Russia is unique. Who is reacting to us in this way? The surviving communist regimes in republics that do not want a really decommunized Russia.

Our irresolution probably consisted in just one thing—the lack of an effective management system that would not reduce all our state activity merely to political recriminations. There was no irresolution regarding all the rest.

[IZVESTIYA] Today foreign and primarily Western politicians and businessmen constantly run up against the following situation when they embark on economic contacts and talks with us. Pankin tells them that the center no longer deals with foreign economic relations. Russian Foreign Minister Kozyrev says: We no longer deal with this. History moves slowly, of course, but our foreign partners increasingly often get the sense that their partner has simply vanished. In principle we should not be thinking about them, but about ourselves.

[Burbulis] We are often told: Stop being suspicious of the emerging new structures; go on, "put" your own people—thoughtful people with a clear understanding of the general Russian aim—in them. Stop reinforcing yourselves in this suspicion.

Russia's task, since it does not have its own professional structures to manage this fathomless economy, is to carefully take on board [vosprinyat] the moribund union structures—structures that are paralyzed, but exist. This is one of the specific tasks of salvation, and all these economic departments are flocking to us and saying: Take us over before we fall apart, before we are bought up by all kinds of joint ventures and cooperatives.

[IZVESTIYA] Yes, to be deflected into the slogan that whoever is not with us is against us would be extremely dangerous now. A kind of civil war is under way in the hearts of a great many people, and if the authorities act according to the biblical maxim that whoever is not against us is with us, people's hearts will be disposed toward civil accord because we are truly at the turning point between historical eras. Russia must clearly move in precisely this direction.

[Burbulis] Certainly, and the necessary political means exist for this. Take the following question, for instance: Can Yeltsin and his "team" carry out social, political, and economic reforms without creating a stable social base for them? And to what extent can hopes be pinned on the so-called people in their totally stratified condition? I am convinced that a considerable proportion of voters opted for by no means an intelligent program for reforms but for a savior. That is, this was a purely religious form of protest and hope, and now it is clear to me at any rate: We must finally see where we stand regarding the social base. Who supports progress? What strata of the population, what social forces?

[IZVESTIYA] What could you say about relations between the president's "team" and parliament? Not so much about the personal relations, even, as about the possible loss of overall unity?

[Burbulis] It seems to me that the touchstone of these relations was the question of elections of the executive at local level. After making an appeal to parliament proposing that the date of the elections be postponed and not receiving a positive response to it, the president was forced to veto this law.

There are two ways out of this position. Either this will bring the deputies to their senses and they will realize at long last that they are dealing with a president for whom more Russians voted than voted for the whole of them taken together. Or the deputies will harden their stance, will go the whole way, and then one final, proven move will remain—recourse to the people, to the population, and the creation of a situation that is in a way dangerous but that we need: support from below. There will be simply nothing else left for us to do. But before we are faced with this necessity, we must try to convince the deputies and to appeal to those of them who in their emotions have remained our comrades in arms, want a new Russia, and want reforms for Russia but who have been traumatized by being kept to some extent at arms' length from the president they created.

[IZVESTIYA] Do you not expect Yeltsin's statement about the upcoming liberalization of prices to have a similar effect to Ryzhkov's promise at one time to raise prices?

[Burbulis] We did not do enough to explain this statement, of course. The principle as state policy is one thing, and the forms, pace, and rate of its implementation are quite another. This must be explained.

Tell me: Can anyone firmly assert nowadays that he knows what the state of the majority of the population really is at present? We are told that the population is unhappy, that it is afraid and angry with the authorities. But we have a different impression: Many people have now realized that the classic Soviet legacy that has found expression in immutable prices belongs to the past. Prices will change, and we must adapt to this.

Furthermore, people try to convince us that Yeltsin's popularity is declining and that we should expect an explosion. Nothing of the sort. It is not declining; it is changing modality, but the religious hope pinned on his abilities, on some kind of miracle-working that remains. When he returned from vacation I think the president reaffirmed his ability to say exceptionally complex things in confident and trusting language. He says: Yes, it will be terribly hard, but, trust me and support us, things will become easier later.

[IZVESTIYA] Do you have no feeling that real policy continues to be shaped by the Boldins? In general, why is the structure of executive power in Russia so cumbersome?

[Burbulis] I can agree only that this structure is as yet acting insufficiently harmoniously, but certainly not that it is cumbersome. I am convinced that the proposed system is satisfactory, but the fact that its embodiment is linked with specific people is a different matter.

For instance, Yuriy Vladimirovich Petrov, leader of the president's administration, has come into the purview of the mass media as an odious figure, but I get no sense of this. I do not feel this on the basis of real, everyday contacts with him, sometimes five or six times a day. Although I do have tremendous difficulties with the apparatus life in principle—I was precipitated into it from nowhere and it has its own laws and rules: You act, you wink, you speak, you remain silent. I do not know these rules, and I think that is my strength, but personally I do not see Petrov as an odious person who is in confrontation with the general aims. People say and write that he is a villain who has been brought in, has grabbed the axis of management, and is drawing up his own decisionmaking procedure.

There is something else that is true: A certain apparatus does wield power. These are people whose names none of us knows. On several occasions I have tried to find out: Here is a draft decree, and here are amendments made by the apparatus that totally change its concept. Tell me, who made those amendments? People tell me: specialists from the legal department. But these specialists have names, send them here so we can discuss why this is happening. No, as a rule there are no names. But we are romantics, we accepted the Council of Ministers even in its Vlasov form, we accepted it as it was, and we did not carry out any audit there. Those who absolutely disagreed rapidly left and many of them joined Polozkov, but the overwhelming majority stayed.

And the second point is this.

What is the U.S. President? He is someone who has been preparing his team for decades, and when he becomes leader he has everything ready, everything to hand. As you know, that is not how things were in our country. In our country there was not even normal, full-blooded parliamentarianism. There is no developed system of ownership, there is no civil society in the form of stable political parties. In such a situation how is it possible to maneuver? Therefore all Boris Nikolayevich's unorthodox actions are shock moves. They have been seen as steps into a debacle rather than as creative steps.

[IZVESTIYA] Please tell us what exactly your post—RSFSR state secretary—is?

[Burbulis] There is the State Council, which is not envisaged by the Constitution and is a consultative organ helping to elaborate the president's domestic and foreign policy and his strategy. The State Council has a secretary—Russia's state secretary.

My task is to organize the work of the State Council and coordinate the activity of its members. We had experience of creating a stable consultative organ in the form of the Higher Consultative and Coordination Council. Today I look after the Russian Foreign Ministry, Ministry of Internal Affairs, KGB, Ministry of Information and the Press, Defense Committee, and to a lesser extent the Ministry of Justice and Ministry of Finance. As you have noted, these are departments that cannot work fruitfully without a coordinated objective, which is something they lacked during a year as part of the traditional Council of Ministers. They were simply departments.

The State Council members are also a new structure, an enforced structure designed to help the president to elaborate a clear state-political strategy and, within the framework of that strategy, the decisions needed for stable development. In short, the state secretary is the person who ensures that Russia's foreign and domestic policy is coordinated with the viewpoint of the president's final decisions.

The second point is this. It so happens that in "origin" I am a representative of the humanitarian intelligentsia with a philosophy degree and I have defended dissertations. When Boris Nikolayevich, Yuriy Alekseyevich Ryzhov, and I "invented" the Higher Consultative and Coordination Council, the whole attraction of the new organ was that Boris Nikolayevich would receive, as it were, the direct support of the intelligentsia, with all its weak points and strong points. That is, the state secretary is also a kind of bridge to intellectual support for the authorities.

There is also a third function, and this is the most burdensome one. Since all the other structures have some kind of specific subject of everyday activity, I am also a kind of drainage system. Because anybody who comes to see the Russian leadership tries and tries to get to see people but, if he cannot get anywhere, he comes to see the state secretary because his door is always open.

[IZVESTIYA] Boris Nikolayevich said that he had coordinated his speech talking of the upcoming releasing of prices. In that case please tell us how far the team supports the releasing of prices. Second, what is the attitude of the president's team toward privatization and its pace?

[Burbulis] This was coordinated with the team, with the State Council, at the level of general principles of policy for the current period. Without liberalization of prices we will be unable to do anything. When prices go up and soar without an intelligent policy, this is more terrible for the population.

What has not been coordinated with the team and where does our unprofessionalism lie? Developed political power, when it begins the working week, must articulate the behavior of all its members. Who remains totally silent but does such and such, who is supposed to talk about one part of the work, who is supposed to talk about another. As yet we improvise, and this is our problem. Of course, there is just one hope—some kind of moral solidarity, but unfortunately as yet there is no school, no hard-won rules of behavior which, if observed, will mean working for the common result. We will gather experience and create a school.

[IZVESTIYA] Please tell us how you find it to work with Yeltsin.

[Burbulis] Personally in my own work I have a lot of difficulties and hitches, but Boris Nikolayevich has one trait that complements literally everything and, I am convinced, thanks to this trait I will never be able to let him down, whatever is threatened—my personal career or biography. In addition to his clear willpower and unorthodox mind, he also has a rare ability for sympathy and compassion—a purely Russian quality. This is combined with heightened trust that in the past was quite impermissible for a politician at such a level.

[IZVESTIYA] What do you think, in Boris Nikolayevich's long past in the nomenklatura, is important in order to assess him?

[Burbulis] His decade in the party in Sverdlovsk Oblast was marked by the fact that he used his membership of the system to a great extent to work for people. There were all kinds of stories that he is a dictator and is intolerant. In fact this is not so. He is not a person given to delving into ideology. There was a need to protect people, to achieve the plan, and to spur on construction projects, and he did this brilliantly.

Moscow naturally sat on him, and I think he still feels the horror at the collective betrayal. I think that the wound he received then from his party comrades remains in his heart forever, and his renaissance is something quite miraculous.

[IZVESTIYA] There are calculations showing that the citizen of the country and the president are today divided by about 13 levels of power. At the same time, it has been scientifically proven that for there to be democracy, there should be no more than four or five levels between them. In your view, what should power be like if it is to be strong and effective?

[Burbulis] What constitutes strong power? If it is a matter of strong-arm methods, I could offer IZVESTIYA a separate essay entitled "What Is Strong Power?" If power is coupled with a rigid, disciplinary, normal system of behavior, that is one thing, but if power is coupled with professionalism and a strategy understood by the population and with the ability to implement that strategy in a real situation, that is something else again. That is, there is now a huge need for strong power, but the understanding of power may be totally different.

As for specific Russian power, I can tell you that the three days of a putsch were a kind of eruption of political creativity. We all felt real delight at the result, a sense that we had been of some use, but it would be wrong to believe that everything could be reduced to those three days. The Russian leadership had been in the minefield of power for the whole year, and as I am fond of saying, that year was worthy of this result. We had managed to achieve something over the course of the year, and it is hard to say whether the result would have been the same had other people been in the team and in power. I do not know, I am not sure. After all, 80 percent of the regions of Russia did not support us during the putsch—neither the soviets, nor the presidiums, nor the executive committees—and when people tell us that we have not done much, you constantly feel like replying: Let's be honest in our recollection of the conditions in which we were working and are continuing to work.

Fedorov Interviewed on Reform Views

PM3010220091 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No. 42, 20-27 Oct 91 p2

[Report on interview with Svyatoslav Fedorov, prospective candidate for the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, RSFSR, premiership, by Dmitriy Sidorov; place, date not given: "Svyatoslav Fedorov: Russia Can Be Transformed in a Year"]

[Text] Svyatoslav Fedorov was recently the first to be named by the Vesti TV news show as a candidate for Russia's premiership.

The successful head of the leading eye-surgery clinic was surprised to receive a telephone call from Boris Yeltsin, who suggested nominating him as a candidate for the USSR premiership.

"I refused right away," said Svyatoslav Fedorov. "I don't believe I could work well with Gorbachev. After a pause Yeltsin suggested I consider another post, that of Russia's premiership. I gave my consent, specifying that I'm prepared to occupy the post for one year. The term is sufficient to turn this country from a concentration camp into a free state.

What has to be done? Within three months the land should be given to the peasants, who must have the right to sell it to anyone, including foreigners. Farmers must be exempt from taxation for five years. Privatization of state property must be done as quickly as possible. Factories must be turned over to societies of shareholders. Large enterprises must be split up-when too many people are involved it is difficult to reach a decision. All the ministries governing individual branches of the economy, must be promptly disbanded, rather than turning them into associations.

Fedorov is perfectly aware that the philosophy underlying his programme will not be to the liking of many ministers in Russia's Cabinet and Parliament.

There's every indication that quite a few of them would rather have spheres of influence divided among themselves than make real steps aimed at boosting living standards in the Republic.

Fedorov is perfectly aware that his position makes his chances of becoming Russia's Prime Minister rather slim. He says he wouldn't be too upset. Besides, his wife was abhorred at the prospect. She said that the premiership would imply complete isolation, emphasized by a limo and bodyguards.

Fedorov believes that the only person capable of leading Russia's economy out of its current crisis is Larisa Piyasheva. "It's either her or the arrival of another Jesus Christ in the guise of Augusto Pinochet."

Kuban Prohibits Export of Food Outside Russia

PM3010131591 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 26 Oct 91 p 2

[Untitled TASS report under the "In Brief" rubric]

[Text] Temporary restrictions on exporting agricultural produce and foodstuffs from the Kuban outside the Russian Federation, except for state deliveries, have been introduced by the Krasnodar Kray administration.

Export Restrictions in Rostov

LD3010210591 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1600 GMT 28 Oct 91

[Text] Temporary restrictions on exporting agricultural output and foodstuffs outside the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic have been introduced on the territory of Rostov Oblast. The oblast leadership believes this is a forced measure. Previously the Ukraine leadership and a number of republics in the northern Caucasus unilaterally introduced restrictions on exporting food and industrial goods from their territory. At the same time they are engaged in actively buying foodstuffs in Rostov Oblast. This creates a certain amount of social tension in the oblast.

Labor Minister on 'Polish Shock Therapy'

LD3010235191 Moscow TASS in English 2259 GMT 30 Oct 91

[Text] Moscow October 30 TASS—Nikolay Shokhin, Russian Minister of Labour, told the RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA on Thursday [31 October] Russia's independent economic policy is the last real chance to preserve the union from disintegration.

Shokhin stressed the need to stabilise the republic's finances and monetary system to prevent a financial crisis.

He believes the ruble will not be a national currency.

"We have missed the time for forming a competitive market, and carrying out de-monopolisation and privatisation to create a mechanism of free competition and curb price hikes. Therefore, the only way is the Polish shock therapy, and that means an economic recession and unemployment," Shokhin said.

He said the Russian government will be able to support only the most poor sections of the population.

Yavlinskiy, Rutskoy on Prime Ministerial Post

LD2710232991 Moscow Central Television Vostok Program and Orbita Networks in Russian 1700 GMT 27 Oct 91

[Interview with Russian Federation economic adviser Grigoriy Yavlinskiy and Russian Federation Vice President Aleksandr Rutskoy by MOSKOVSIKYE NOVOSTI observer Lyudmila Telen on the "Russian Prime Minister: Who?" program; place, date not given—recorded]

[Excerpts] [Telen] Grigoriy Alekseyevich, has the president of Russia offered you the post of Russian prime minister?"
[Yavlinskiy] No, there has been no such direct offer as yet.

[Telen] If there were such an offer, would you agree?
[Yavlinskiy] Yes, I would agree.

[Telen] What would your first step be in that capacity?
[Yavlinskiy] The formation of a vigorous government.

[Telen] Who would you invite to your team?
[Yavlinskiy] The first principle is professionals, and moreover, professionals enjoying the trust of the Russian parliament and the Russian president. And people who are honest.

[Telen] Could you find a common language with the people who are preparing economic reform for Russia, I mean the economists?
[Yavlinskiy] I can say firmly that in the first place it is always easier to find a common language with professionals, and second, this language has to be found. In that case, I would do everything necessary to find a common platform and mutual understanding. [passage omitted]

[Telen] Aleksandr Vladimirovich, a while ago you said that you were ready to take on the portfolio of Russian prime minister. What was the reaction of the president of Russia to that?
[Rutskoy] You know, Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin is a correct man, he hasn't said anything to me yet.

[Telen] Are you ready to take on this post now, too?
[Rutskoy] You see, the point is that if it is a question of whether I am capable or not, then I am capable. Why do I think I am capable? Because at this stage of crisis, what is needed is a tough system of administrative governance. Where does that lie? Setting the task, ensuring execution of the task, monitoring that execution, and making tough demands. What is needed at present is toughness, toughness; nothing else will save us. The time for demagoguery has already gone, and the slogans have died. If we occupy ourselves with trivia, with this demagoguery, arguing about what if we do it one way, what if we do it another way, then people will simply fail to understand us. We cannot go on joking with people any more. [passage omitted]

Russian Customs Committee Established

LD2910105991 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 2100 GMT 28 Oct 91

[Text] A Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] state customs committee has been set up in the Russian Federation by decree of president of the republic. It has been formed for the purpose of ensuring the economic foundations of sovereignty and the state security of the RSFSR and protecting the interests of the people of the Russian Federation. (Anatoliy Kruglev) has been appointed chairman of the committee. Under the decree, the chairman of the RSFSR customs committee holds the office of first deputy chairman of the USSR Customs Committee.

Government Appoints New Ministry Heads

OW2810225491 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1700 GMT 29 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The Russian Council of Ministers has appointed the following people to these posts: V. Alikperov is the new Chairman of the Committee on the oil industry in the Russian Ministry for Fuel and Energy. V. Zaidenvarg has been confirmed president of the Russian State Corporation for the Coal Industry (Coal of Russia).

President's Information Chief Reassigned

PM2910114991 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 26 Oct 91 p 3

[Unattributed report under general heading: "Official Chronicle"]

[Text] By a decree of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] president, Valentin Mikhaylovich Sergeyev has been relieved of his duties as the fully empowered representative of the chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers with the rank of RSFSR minister and as chief of the RSFSR president's information department in connection with his transfer to other work.

President of New Citizens' Rights Group Named

PM2910114591 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 Oct 91 p 1

[Untitled report from PRAVDA-TASS column]

[Text] A republic foundation for the defense of citizens' rights and law and order has been set up in Russia. V. Komissarov, Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic first deputy minister of internal affairs, has been elected its president.

Russian Revival Party Holds Founding Congress

LD2710193291 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1301 GMT 1301 GMT 26 Oct 91

[By TASS correspondent Andrey Palariya]

[Text] Moscow, 26 Oct (TASS)—Reviving the Russian people's faith in their own powers and rebuilding their centuries-old statehood within its natural geopolitical borders were the goals of the founding congress initiators of the Revival [Vozrozhdeniye] Party, which opened today in the Soviet capital. Over two days its participants are to discuss their program and the party rules, and they are to elect its ruling bodies.

"We want to direct all our activities for the good of the people," stated Aleksandr Anisimov, a member of the organizational committee. "The main way to attain this goal is for each citizen to be allocated a share of property sufficient for him to have enough to provide for his material and economic independence and for his spiritual and political self-determination. One of the main tasks which the party sets itself is to see the revival of the middle class, without whom the state will simply perish."

Speeches by participants in the congress have noted that today it is essential that firm and decisive support be given to the Russian- speaking populations in the republics who wish to unite with Russia. In connection with this, when the work of the congress comes to an end, deputies of the Revival Party are planning to leave for the Dnestr Republic and the Ukraine in order to support the populations of these republics.

Representatives of a number of Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic republics and oblasts, as well as representatives of public associations, have attended the congress and spoken there. Vladimir Zhirinovskiy, leader of the USSR Liberal Democratic Party, has also spoken here, and he has called upon them to dispel the defeatist sentiments put about by the media.

Isolation From Other Republics Viewed

PM2910144091 Moscow MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI in Russian No. 42, 20 Oct 91 pp 6-7

[Article by Deputy Chief Editor Stepan Kiselev: "Froth on the Angel's Lips"]

[Text] MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI has learned from an absolutely reliable source that in the corridors of the Russia Government last week, the question of the possibility of an exchange of nuclear strikes between the independent Ukraine and the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] was discussed. It seems that the idea of state sovereignty is threatening to turn from good to evil, and apparently the wise man of our times was right when he said that the devil is born out of the froth on an angle's lips.

The angel of independence that soared above the Baltic states two years ago has since visited each of the 15 colonies of the socialist empire. Hovering above every home the angel trumpeted the charming hymn of freedom and led the people to build barricades when the forces of evil attempted to herd them back into their stable. The angel guided the hand of the lawmakers when they signed papers declaring the vassals of the Kremlin to be sovereign states. He also whispered into their ears the ideas of national currencies, republican armies, and customs houses to ensure complete sovereignty.

The angel of independence is now soaring above the Russian White House where they are discussing the idea of Russia leaving the Union. The parliament is discussing the problem of Russian statehood and its capacity to uphold the interests of the peoples populating the Russian Federation. In other words, preparations are under way for a customs war against yesterday's cellmates, for a war of embassies and banks. With the current clamor next door for regaining the lost territories, the Russian White House is looking for ways to resolve border conflicts as well. A possible scenario of such a conflict is an exchange of blows between Russia and the Ukraine, which has already laid claim to the Black Sea naval fleet. Things seem to be following the classical pattern: if you want peace, prepare for war. The agent of independence is trying on the garb of the god of war.

"Neighboring states are in a natural manner enemies in relations to each other," wrote Gabriel Bonnot de Mably more than 200 years ago. Thus, the authors of the "divorce" scenario have not invented anything new. The Frenchman was smarter than they, because he added these words: "They are enemies except in the case where their common weakness makes them form a union based on confederation."

The economic agreement signed in Alma-Ata by representatives of 12 Republics is in fact an attempt to form a union between "neighboring states." "Their common weakness" is the production slump, inflation, and reduced trade, which prompt a union between the Republics on the basis of a single economic area. Perhaps Russia's weakness has not been fully realized by the Russian ministers, who are trying to derail the Alma-Ata agreement. They are still under the popular illusion that "a rich Russia will make out without the Republics, which are only robbing it today." The angel of independence has spread its wings over the ministers who, flushed with the victory over communism, are still going ahead making revolutions. As true revolutionaries, they refuse to recognize any sway of economic laws. The central authority that collapsed in August is still seen by them as a treacherous and evil force trying to snatch their power from them. The ministers are affected by "center phobia." Russia is ecstatic.

The economic agreement, which some of the Russian White House ministers are warring against, does limit their powers, but political maturation always means putting certain limits on otherwise unlimited powers. This much has long been understood in Europe where the sovereignty of the governments of France, Britain or Italy are being curtailed by the economic laws of the Common Market. Understanding this much, Europe is building its security on the foundation of powerful economic relations, while Russia follows uncharted paths, ignoring the European experience. The "rebellious ministers" in her White House are reading themselves for a confrontation with, say, the Ukraine, instead of trying to form a union with it.

Should today's trend towards Russia's cutting itself off from the other Republics prevail, a wider campaign for a "strong Russia" could soon develop, and then, fascinated with the idea, the mob will start to shout: "Russia for Russians," and that will bring the country within one step from border conflicts and civil war. Mikhail Gorbachev was right, saying in his recent TV appearance that the separatist tendency, if allowed to grow, is fraught with tragedies that can eclipse the current conflict between the Serbs and Croats. The bloodshed in Karabakh, South Ossetia and the Dnestr region would then look like children's pranks in front of the Christmas tree.

As for the Russian president, he is acting strangely. While he seems to like the economic agreement, he has not dissociated himself publicly from the policy of his ministers. Is Yeltsin in for a spell of compromises and jockeying for position, which landed Gorbachev under house arrest in his Foros retreat? Yeltsin's aides are of course different people, and his situation is totally different from the one Gorbachev found himself in in August, but the time for taking control of the situation is slipping away. On the lips of the angel of independence there is still froth.

Moldova

Threat To Nationalize Union Enterprises Cited

PM3110093691 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 30 Oct 91 Union Edition p 1

[Untitled report from IZVESTIYA, TASS, RIA, POSTFACTUM, UPI column]

[Text] Enterprises under Union jurisdiction that are on the territory of Moldova are to be transferred without compensation to the republic's jurisdiction by 1 December 1991.

This is stated in a document ratified by the Moldova Government regulating the procedure for the transfer of enterprises. If Union departments refuse to do this, the document says, the Moldova Government will adopt a decision to nationalize them.

'Heavy-Industry' Combines Taken Over

AU3010201191 Bucharest ROMPRES in English 1943 GMT 30 Oct 91

[Text] Chisinau [Kishinev] ROMPRES, 30/10/1991—The Government of the Republic of Moldova has decreed the nationalization of all Soviet enterprises in the country's territory, under a resolution passed in the republic's parliament.

The decree stipulates the taking over under Moldovan control of all federal enterprises—some 30 per cent of the total—"without financial compensation," together with the bank accounts of the respective enterprises.

The most important industrial units Chisinau has taken over include the heavy-industry combines in the Russian-speaking region of the Dnestr.

President Snegur Criticizes Gorbachev

OW3110132991 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1148 GMT 31 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] President Mircea Snegur of Moldova has denounced the efforts of President Mikhail Gorbachev to preserve the Soviet Union. In an interview with Danish television he said that Moldova has the same rights as the Baltic countries "because its current position stems from the same Molotov-Ribbentrop pact". The president stressed that much depends on the attitude of Russia to Moldovan independence.

According to Snegur, Moldova might sign the Economic Treaty after studying the supplementing documents.

On the situation in the Gagauz region and the Dnestr river valley, the President said "there will [be] no Croatian script of developments in Moldova".

Ministry of National Security Established

LD3010212491 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 1000 GMT 29 Oct 91

[Excerpts] [Announcer] [Passage omitted] In place of the disbanded KGB of Moldova, a Ministry for National Security has appeared, tasked with operating in an independent and sovereign Moldova. Our correspondent Irina Koval has obtained the first details about how the new department will organize its activities at a news conference held by staff of the Moldovan Ministry of National Security. [passage omitted]

[Correspondent Irina Koval] Let me say right away that in charge of the ministry is Moldovan People's Deputy Anatol Plugaru who is quite a well-known personality in the republic's political life.

[Begin Plugaru recording] First of all, we intend to cleanse ourselves of all that this system has been working for over the past decades. I do not think that there are grounds for accusing the current generation of state security personnel of grave sins, grave crimes against the people, as one might accuse—and with good reason—the previous generations, the people who linked their fates to this organization.

If we discover that someone has soiled his hands and acted disgracefully, has acted against the people and against the state, then we shall of course act.

Many years of dependence on the USSR KGB have now ended. There is no longer any such dependence, in any sphere at all, but there is still some need to work together. In a number of issues to do with logistics, in a number of issues to do with personnel training, if I may be so bold as to say this, there is a reorientation of personnel taking place, toward protecting the highest interests of the republic, toward securing its independence and prosperity.

We have built up a very strong staff, with great potential. Despite the criticism, we do not want to lose highly-professional people, because we will not go far without professionals. When we see that one of our staff has neither the interest nor desire to serve the people, that he is orientated in another direction, then he will be given work in another authority, of another state probably.

Some of the changes we have already managed to make. First, we have disbanded the notorious Z Unit—the so-called Fifth Line, poltical investigation. We no longer go in for this, and I hope we never will again. Let political trends compete against each other as much as they want. We are not interested in that. [end recording]

Presidential Election Campaign Called Normal

OW3110040391 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1500 GMT 30 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] In Moldova, about 2 million 200 thousand voters, including one thousand from the Dnester area, will take part in the republican presidential election on December 8, the republican electoral commission chairman Vladimir Kiktenko said. He was speaking after the commission's meeting.

Moldova has a total of 2 million 900 thousand voters.

Kiktenko says preparation for the elections was going on normally, except for some areas in the left bank of the Dnester, where local leaders have refused to open electoral commissions.

So far, the Central Electoral Commission has registered two candidates for the president of Moldova—the incumbent, Mircea Snegur and the former republican communist leader Grigoriy Yeremey. They collected 25 thousand signatures in their support.

Minister Hopes To Attract Foreign Capital

LD3010220191 Moscow TASS in English 1338 GMT 30 Oct 91

[By TASS correspondent Valeriy Demidetskiy]

[Text] Kishinev October 30 TASS—"Our main task is to achieve Moldavia's broad international recognition," Moldavian Foreign Minister Nikolae Tiu told the newspaper "SFATUL TARII." He believes this would help attract foreign capital to the republic in order to "reanimate the economy." However, the minister admitted that this is a far from easy task. He said "foreign diplomats know nothing about Moldavia and ask us to indicate it on a geography map before going over to negotiations."

Nevertheless, some initial results were achieved during the Moldavian foreign minister's visit to the United States and the meetings he had there with counterparts from Zimbabwe, Colombia and Ecuador. Plans are afoot to start talks on the establishment of diplomatic relations between these countries and Moldavia. The Swedish delegate on the United Nations said his country's recognition of Moldavia's independence depended on the situation in the USSR. Agreement was reached with the U.S. delegate on the United Nations to establish direct contacts through the American ambassador in Moscow.

Nicolae Tiu believes that purposeful work should be conducted with foreign embassies in Moscow, that there should be more visits abroad at different levels in order to achieve Moldavia's recognition throughout the world.

National Bank in Conflict With Dnestr Banks

LD3010220291 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 2000 GMT 30 Oct 91

[Text] A regular round of talks on settling a financial conflict between the National Bank of Moldova and banking organizations in the Dnestr Republic is being held in Tiraspol today. Representatives of the Russian Republic bank who arrived in Moldova this morning have undertaken the role of mediator. The heart of the conflict is that the National Bank of Moldova refuses to pay about 300 million rubles [R] for products delivered to enterprises in the Dnestr Republic. Leonid Tolmach, president of the National Bank, justifies this by saying that the Dnestr Republic has registered four banks in the Ukraine, thereby trying to get out of financial subordination to Kishinev. In turn, bankers in the Dnestr Republic do not wish to register their institutions in Kishinev since in that case they will be presented with a claim for R800 million the very sum that the Dnestr Republic owes to Moldova's republic budget.

Ukraine

'Unauthorized' Missile Launch in Kirovograd

LD3010142391 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1200 GMT 30 Oct 91

[Text] There has been an unauthorized launch of a ground-to-air missile from the Kirovograd area in the direction of Kremenchug during maintenance work at a military unit. The missile flew for seven kilometers and came down in a field. There was no explosion and there were no casualties.

Accidental Launch Confirmed

LD3010182591 Moscow TASS in English 1438 GMT 30 Oct 91

[By UKRINFORM-TASS correspondent Nikolay Zayka]

[Text] Kiev October 30 TASS—A ground-to-air missile was accidentially launched in the Ukraine. This was confirmed by the first deputy commander of the Anti-Aircraft Defense Army Lieutenant-General P. Melnikov. The accident was earlier reported by the foreign mass media.

"There has, indeed, been such an accidental launching," Melnikov told UKRINFORM. "It occurred during maintenance works in a military unit, deployed at Svetlovodsk, Kirovograd region. It was caused by the short circuiting of cables due to dampening. The missile flew seven kilometers towards Kremenchug, Poltava region, and fell in the fields. There was no explosion and, consequently, no casualties. The missile had no nuclear warhead."

Ministerial Talks With Russia Conclude

OW3010205291 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1930 GMT 30 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Talks closed between Russia and the Ukraine in Kiev on Wednesday [30 October]. Participating were foreign, defense and deputy finance ministers.

The delegation heads emphasized at the evening press-conference that the talks had been aimed at framing new strategic relationships beteen the two republics.

"Our republics are having a hard time, and the Centre is trying to take advantage of our difficulties and hampers our progress whenever possible," said the Ukraine's Foreign Minister Anatoliy Zlenko.

The Russian Foreign Minister Andrey Kozyrev hailed the Ukraine's independent line and expressed the hope that connections beteen the two nations would grow stronger.

A protocol was signed on cooperation and coordination of activities between the two Foreign Ministries. The sides will seek consensus in addresssing all moot questions.

The protocol says that the republics have no claims on each other's territory.

Defense Ministers Konstantin Kobets and Konstantin Morozov confirmed that each republic has a right to form own armed forces.

Both republics want the Union's nuclear potential to be under central control, with the republics represented in control structures. It was recognized expedient to destroy nuclear missiles in the Ukraine, not relocate them to other regions.

Environment Minister on Chernobyl Closure

LD3010141991 Kiev Radio Kiev in English
0100 GMT 30 Oct 91

[Text] We begin tonight's digest with a report about the work of the session of Ukraine's Supreme Soviet. Today [29 October] the deputies passed a resolution on the closure of the Chernobyl nuclear plant in 1993 and entrusted the Cabinet of Ministers to work out a concept for the power and fuel supply program of Ukraine by 15 November.

I'd like to remind you that for the first time the decision to close the nuclear plant by 1995 was taken in winter of 1990. But in connection with the recent fire at the second unit which occurred on 11 October, the deputies decided to accelerate this process. Speaking about the Chernobyl plant, the Minister of Environment Yuriy Shcherbak pointed out:

[Shcherbak is heard briefly in Ukrainian, fading into English translation] I think that it is possible to accelerate the fulfillment of the decision and to close the Chernobyl nuclear plant in 1992. I want to say also that the investigation after the fire showed that there was no radiation emission. But nonetheless the plant should be closed in any case. It is also necessary to create a control body over all nuclear power plants, said Yuriy Shcherbak.

The minister also dwelt on the problem of the sarcophagus about the fourth unit of the Chernobyl plant which was ruined in 1986. He suggested to hold an international contest to invite foreign experts so as to decide what's to be done with the shelter instead of placing it into a concrete pyramid with unknown consequences, as it is proposed by the Union Ministry of Power Engineering. Yuriy Shcherbak suggested to take [as heard] a law on nuclear control. The former Soviet Union is the only state which has been existing without having such a law.

Volodymyr Yavorivskyy, chairman of the parliamentary commission on eliminating the consequences of the accident at the Chernobyl nuclear plant, said that today we do not have to turn our face to Moscow in order to solve our own problems because now the entire responsibility for solution of the Chernobyl problem lies on Ukraine's parliament and [word indistinct]. Then he said:

[Yavorivskyy is heard briefly in Ukrainian, fading into English translation] We can be asked why the Armenians immediately stopped their nuclear plant after the earthquake. The answer is simple. Our Ukraine was stuffed as a duck with the most primative nuclear technologies and one of the most dangerous of them is the reactor called the MK-1000 [as heard] which, contrary to that in Armenia, cannot be put out of operation within a short period of time. So if we stop our Chernobyl plant in winter, it will become even more dangerous than while it is operating because many of its systems will be frozen. Can we take such a decision today on our soil? No, we cannot. Today, continued Yavorivskyy, the Minister of Power Engineering Sklyarov says that now we face a shortage of power supply, but why was it necessary to stop 22 thermal units knowing that the Chernobyl nuclear plant should be stopped at any cost and that there is no alternative? I want the Ukrainian people to know that from now on the closing of the Chernobyl plant has begun with strict observance of all necessary technological [word indistinct], said Volodymyr Yavorivskyy.

Today the deputies of Ukraine's Supreme Soviet took [as heard] an appeal to the United Nations organization. It says that during the latest five years great political changes have taken place in the world, which resulted in an active nuclear disarmament, mutual confidence, and striving for a fruitful cooperation. Comprehending this and knowing that the Chernobyl nuclear plant is a threat on a global scale, the parliament of Ukraine has taken a decision to put the plant out of operation. The complexity of this problem makes Ukraine address the United Nations and governments of the world countries for assistance.

On behalf of Ukraine's people and all those who had suffered from the accident at Chernobyl plant, the Supreme Soviet of the independent Ukraine asks the United Nations to become the initiator of creating a scientific technological program on putting the nuclear plant out of operation and a special fund for a purposeful complex solution of this problem. The Supreme Soviet of Ukraine hopes that all countries of the world, primarily nuclear powers, will support this humane initiative, reads the address of Ukraine's Supreme Soviet to the United Nations.

Decision on USSR Supreme Soviet Role Detailed

PM3010133191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 28 Oct 91 Union Edition p 1

[S. Tsikora report: "Ukraine in Role of Observer"]

[Text] Kiev—The degree of Ukrainian participation in USSR representative organs of the transitional period has been finally determined after a week of reflection and coordination.

The question was examined by the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet. The preparatory work was headed by Supreme Soviet Deputy Chairman V. Grinev. Presenting the draft decision to parliament, he cited the main arguments which the working group had worked on. The underlying one was the argument that "the Ukraine should not participate in political associations [ob'edineniya] leading to the creation of a new state."

V. Grinev went on to say that "this restriction in effect also settles the question of Ukrainian parliamentarians in the formation and activity of a Union Supreme Soviet. The Ukraine should not participate in the activity of the Union legislative organ. But, in view of the current political situation, it is expedient to send a group of observers to the Soviet of the Republics in the name of the Presidium, and not of the Supreme Soviet."

After the discussion the session adopted a resolution consisting of two points. The first says that the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet "considers inexpedient Ukrainian participation in the creation or activity of any interrepublic structures which lead, or may lead, to the Ukraine's inclusion as a constituent part of another state." The second point instructs the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet Presidium to form a group of republic people's deputies and sent them to the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of the republics as observers."

With these powers the deputies will be able to inform their colleagues in the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of Republics about the Ukraine's position, but will not take part in the voting. V. Grinev said that the Ukraine's current position is extremely accurately and abundantly conveyed by the formula of the well-known U.S. political scientist Z. Brzezinski, who is currently a guest in the republic: "Yes to independence, no to separatism; yes to cooperation, no to subordination."

Supreme Soviet Investigates Coup Involvement

LD3010152491 Kiev Radio Kiev in English 0100 GMT 30 Oct 91

[Text] At the evening sitting of the session [of the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet on the 29th October] the deputies heard a report by Yuriy Haysinskyy, chairman of the temporary commission of Ukraine's parliament on checking the activities of the top officials of Ukraine, of bodies of power, public organizations and unions, during the abortive coup d'etat last August. Yuriy Haysinskyy, in part, said the following:

[Haysinskyy is heard briefly in Ukrainian, fading into English translation] Our commission has been working for exactly two months. For this period the commission checked the work of the Communist Party of Ukraine, the Procurator's Office, radio and TV company, KGB, and Ministry of the Interior. Now it has begun to check the work of the Cabinet of Ministers, of people's deputies, heads of the regional soviets of people's deputies. Forty-five top officials were questioned by the commission during the two months.

Speaking about KGB, continued Yuriy Haysinskyy, I am sure that its reorganization will speed up positive economic reforms and will make it possible to end up with the power helplessness of the authorities. The commission suggested to express distrust towards the KGB board and to replace its head, Holushko, said Yuriy Haysinskyy.

Then Yuriy Haysinskyy said that during the checkup on the activities of the top officials of the Ukraine's Communist Party, documents were found in the safe of the first secretary of the party, Stanislav Hurenko, which testify that the chief of the KGB regularly sent to him secret information on the activities of the parties and movements in Ukraine and a detailed information about the economic situation in the republic.

The members of the commission have got an impression about close ties existing between the leaders of the Communist Party between KGB and central bodies of power of the Union.

Then the Ukraine's Procurator General Viktor Shishkin informed the deputies in his report that five criminal cases are being now investigated against top officials who supported the coup d'etat last August and that some officials were dismissed from their posts.

Today the Supreme Soviet of Ukraine approved (Mykhaylo Kaskevich) as the minister of labor of our republic. The deputies also discharged Oleksandr Maselskyy from the post of the vice prime minister and Oleksandr Kovalenko from the post of the minister of finances upon their request. Tomorrow [30 October] the session will continue its work.

Prime Minister Fokin Views G-7 Talks

LD3010154691 Kiev Radio Kiev in English 0100 GMT 30 Oct 91

[Text] It is very unpleasant to realize that the West still sees in the former Union among these other interests of independent republics. [sentence as heard] That is how the Ukraine's Prime Minister Vitold Fokin assessed the results of the three-day dialogue in Moscow on the international level. This was a meeting with the heads of government of the 12 former Union republics and the deputy finance ministers of the Big Seven. Those were very urgent talks, (?singled) out Vitold Fokin. Participants were not able to reach a unanimity of views on the problems pertaining to the huge foreign debts of the USSR and their repayment. The blame for this lies finally on the center, which would like to make the sovereign republics eternal hostages of its debt. At the talks Ukraine aspired to agree that it will directly pay off its part of the debts of the former Union but not through the Central Bank of the USSR.

Rukh Vice President Comments on Independence

AU3010165591 Hamburg DIE WELT in German 30 Oct 91 p 6

[Interview with Mihaylo Horin, vice president of the "Rukh" popular movement in the Ukraine, by Carl Gustav Stroehm in Kiev; date not given: "In the Future There Will Be a Market Economy"]

[Text] [Stroehm] Mr. Vice President, how do you see the future of the Ukraine?

[Horin] I am an optimist. The Presidency of the Supreme Soviet has made an historic decision: In the future, the Ukraine will not send any deputies to the All-Union Soviet in Moscow. Thus, the Ukraine has finally embarked on the path of independence. Only two of our people will go to Moscow to announce there that the Ukraine will not join any economic or political alliances in Moscow. We will continue to maintain horizontal ties with Russia and the other states, which are developing on the ruins of the Soviet empire. However, we are not ready to establish a new empire in line with Gorbachev's ideas.

[Stroehm] What will happen to the Soviet Army that is on Ukrainian territory?

[Horin] We hope that the Soviet Army that is deployed in the Ukraine will evolve into a national Ukrainian Army. All Ukrainian conscripts will serve in the military only on Ukrainian territory as of now. Those soldiers who have been sent to the Ukraine from the other republics will return home.

[Stroehm] What do you think of the future of the Russian people who live on Ukrainian territory?

[Horin] The Ukrainian movement Rukh and other organizations, such as the Republican Democratic Party, for instance, have always advocated the view that the Ukraine is the fatherland of various nationalities. The various nationalities in our country are not unequal under the law. I myself am convinced that any apparatus of suppression, which might be used against a national minority, is very dangerous, because any repression soon adopts a comprehensive character: It works in a circle of 360 degrees. We know what happened in Germany in the past: Hitler acted against the Jews—and at the same time he also liquidated the German Social Democracy, which had millions of members. This also happened in the Soviet Union: Lenin started to act against the landowners, and in 1938 it ended with the shooting of many Communists in the "big purge." Whoever uses an apparatus of repression should know: It starts with the suppression of the others—and in the end oneself is suppressed or even eliminated.

Thus, if we defend the rights of the Jews, Russians, Armenians, and Greeks, we simultaneously defend the rights of the Ukrainian people.

These are the principles of democracy as I understand it. If a totalitarian state were to develop, I would go to prison again. So far I was in prison for 12 years (under the Soviet regime). I would be the first prisoner in the concentration camp, because it is better to be in a concentration camp than to establish a totalitarian state.

[Stroehm] Do you see the danger of Russian claims to territories in the eastern Ukraine, where there are many Russians?

[Horin] I feel that this pressure is increasing. For the time being Yeltsin has said that as of 1 November Russia wants to base its foreign trade with the Ukraine on foreign currency. They want to frighten us with the threat that they will not give the Ukraine any natural gas, crude oil, or wood. In this connection I would like to state: The times where someone could "give" us something are over once and for all. Now we will build up our relations with Moscow on the principles of the market economy. If we cannot buy natural gas in Russia, we will get other suppliers. If we cannot buy any crude oil from Russia, we will get it from the Arab states or from some other country. In addition, one should not forget that the pipeline for crude oil and natural gas to Europe goes through the Ukraine. If Russia paid us for using our territory, this would cost 3.6 billion rubles. Turning this into crude oil and natural gas would make a considerable amount.

[Stroehm] How do you see the future relations of independent Ukraine with the West, Western Europe, and Germany?

[Horin] The Ukraine has always felt drawn to the West. The Ukraine had traditionally close contacts with Western Europe. Already since the 15th century our young people studied at European universities. If we establish the corresponding economic and social preconditions, we can and will—I am convinced of that—join the EC and be a modern European state.

Republic Economic Indicators Fall

OW3110014291 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1930 GMT 30 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] According to the Ukrainian Statistics Ministry, during the nine months of 1991 the republic's national product dropped 7% from last year's level, and national income registered an 8% fall. As of September, the state employment services received 123,500 job applications, and 3700 were registered as jobless. 7 out of 10 jobless draw unemployment benefits.

Military Worries Over Sovereignty Expressed

OW3110003091 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1930 GMT 30 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] A Wednesday [30 October] session of the Coordinating Council of the movement The Military for Democracy discussed in Moscow the implementation of the military reform while the republics are declaring their sovereignty. Particular concern was expressed over the position of the Ukrainian leadership that seeks the division of the united military, said People's Deputy of the USSR, Lieutenant-Colonel Vasili Erokhin in an interview with IF [INTERFAX].

The military are in an awkward situation as, on the one hand, they are subjected to pressure, including pressure on the part of the Ukrainian military brass and the mass media to force them to place themselves under republican authority.

One of the military units (a signals regiment of the Carpathian military district) has sworn allegiance to the Ukrainian government.

The Coordinating Council of the movement The Military for Democracy decided to ask the Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev to shortly take efficient measures to deal with the standoff.

U.S. Response to Arms Plans Noted

924P0002A Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 25 Oct 91 p 3

[Report by TASS correspondent A. Korolev: "Statement of the State Department Spokesman"]

[Text] Washington, 24 October—The United States has received positively the decision of the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet regarding its intention to make the republic a nuclear-free zone. "We welcome the Ukrainian parliament's renunciation of nuclear arms and its resolve to make the Ukraine free of nuclear weapons," declared Richard Boucher, spokesman of the U.S. State Department.

He expressed concern here, however, in connection with the republic's plans to have its own armed forces. Obviously, the intention to create a strong Ukrainian army, the spokesman for the foreign policy department, observed, "runs counter to the efforts of all nations in Europe and North America for a reduction in armed forces and a strengthening of stability." According to him, the United States "does not believe that the creation of large independent armies would be in keeping with constructive purposes and is concerned at the economic effect which the upkeep of such armies would have."

Boucher once again expressed the hope that all republics in the USSR would "abide by the international commitments" of the Soviet Union.

New Polish Envoy Presented to Journalists

LD3010115991 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 2141 GMT 29 Oct 91

[From the "Television News Service" program]

[Text] Diplomatic relations between the Ukraine and Poland have now risen one step higher. An exchange of envoys has taken place. Jerzy Kozakiewicz, special envoy of the Government of the Republic of Poland in the Ukraine, was presented to journalists today. He is 43 years old and a doctor of historical sciences. "As a historian," he said, "I know that there are many bright pages in the chronicle of relations between the Ukraine and Poland; but unfortunately, people still know too little about them. And yet," said Jerzy Kozakiewicz, who, incidentally, speaks good Ukrainian, "we should concentrate more on building the future together than on getting to grips with the historical past. From my government's point of view, the Ukraine is today one of Poland's most important European partners at all levels of international relations."

Armenia

Defense Minister Shaposhnikov Visits

LD3010153591 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1317 GMT 30 Oct 91

[By TASS correspondent Tigran Liloyan]

[Text] Yerevan, 30 Oct (TASS)—Marshal of Aviation Yevgeniy Shaposhnikov, USSR minister of defense, today arrived in the capital of the republic. He was received by President of Armenia Levon Ter-Petrosyan.

The press secretariat of the republican leader has made no comment on the purpose of the minister's arrival or the contents of the conversation held.

The minister of defense visited Baku yesterday. Issues linked to the decision to set up the republican national defense forces as well as the status of the military units of the USSR Armed Forces on the territory of Azerbaijan were discussed during his meeting with President of Azerbaijan Ayaz Mutalibov.

Azerbaijan

Popular Front Presents Ultimatum to Government

OW3010134791 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1245 GMT 30 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The highest body of Azerbaijan's Popular Front came out with strong demands. If the government of President Ayaz Mutalibov fails to meet them, the Front will stop its cooperation with the authorities, it said.

According to IF's [INTERFAX] correspondent, the Popular Front demands that the local press publish the laws on proclaiming Azerbaijan's independence, on forming a national army and on refusing to join the treaty on economic commonwealth.

The Popular Front considers as invalid the bill on additional measures aimed at stabilizing the situation in Azerbaijan adopted by the Parliament two weeks ago. The bill grants President A. Mutalibov additional powers. The Front argues that there was no quorum at the session which discussed the bill. Besides, the Front insists that additional measures should be taken to stop the export of arms and military equipment from Azerbaijan.

Three Killed in NKAO Violence

LD3010214791 Moscow TASS in English 1156 GMT 30 Oct 91

[By TASS correspondent Vadim Byrkin]

[Text] Stepanakert October 30 TASS—The wave of violence that has swept Nagorno-Karabkh [Autonomous Oblast—NKAO] does not subside. Another three people were killed over the past 24 hours.

According to the commandant's office of the state-of-emergency area, one of the killed was a Stepanakert resident who came under fire from the Azerbaijani township of Kirkidzhan on Tuesday afternoon.

The other two were killed on Tuesday night in Armenian villages of Ovsepavan and Mekhtishen of Askeran district by a group of unidentified people who then drove away 140 cows from the Mekhtishen village livestock farm to the Azerbaijani residential area of khodzhally.

An AN-2 airliner of the Yevlakh Air Transportation Organisation of the Azerbaijani Civil Aviation Adminsitration crashed in Nagorno-Karabakh on Tuesday in dense fog near Khanabad village in Askeran district.

The plane hit a rock, villagers told TASS. Three people on board were killed, according to a report from the Nagorno-Karabakh department for internal affairs. An investigation of the accident is under way.

Incident on Azerbaijani-Turkish Border Noted

LD3010171191 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1400 GMT 30 Oct 91

[Report by correspondent Andrey Veduta]

[Text] A TASS correspondent has been informed at the Main Directorate of Border Troops that an incident took place on 29 October during an official ceremony to open a bridge over the Araks River at the Soviet-Turkish border. Speaking on the republican television the day before the ceremony, Geydar Aliyev, head of the Nakhichevan Supreme Majlis, called on the local population to attend the ceremony. Nearly 40,000 people turned up at the bridge at a certain time. Aliyev did not arrive until five hours later. The most impatient people at the meeting stormed the bridge without waiting for Aliyev to arrive. At least 10,000 Azeris entered Turkish territory. According to available information, six of them crossed the Turkish-Iranian border, which is situated nearby, and presently they are in Iran. The Turkish police are taking measures to extradite the other intruders to the USSR. Two people were killed in the crush.

Parliament Issues Appeal on Independence

OW3010142891 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1245 GMT 30 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The Azeri parliament resumed its session in Baku on Tuesday and adopted an appeal to the UN, peoples of the world and sovereign republics in connection with proclaiming independence.

According to our Baku correspondent, this was followed by acute debates on the draft bill concerning a permanent body subordinate to the parliament. Prepared by the conciliatory commission, the draft failed to satisfy the opposition.

Speaking on behalf of the opposition, deputy chairman of the Popular Front Isa Gambarov read a statement which points out that if the "unconstructive discussion" of the draft continues, opposition MPs [members of parliament] will refuse to join the interim body and recall their representatives from permanent parliamentary commissions.

Georgia

Republic Supreme Council Activities Described

Fails To Open 30 Oct

LD3110042891 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 0130 GMT 31 Oct 91

[Text] The Georgian Supreme Council's opening session, scheduled for 30 October, did not take place. Discussion of republican economic problems is postponed indefinetely, STUDINFORM reports, because neither parliament Chairman Asatiani nor his deputy arrived for the opening.

Declines To Sign Economic Treaty 31 Oct

LD3110095791 Moscow TASS in English 0942 GMT 31 Oct 91

[By SAKINFORM-TASS correspondents Eduard Ediberidze and Tengiz Grigalashvili]

[Text] Tbilisi October 31 TASS—Georgia refuses to join the economic community treaty that is to be signed between the sovereign states—republics of the former USSR. Having analysed the treaty's basic provisions, a session of the Georgian Supreme Soviet, which began on Wednesday, decided not to sign the document. The majority of the parliament, including the opposition, believe it infringes upon Georgia's sovereignty.

Shaposhnikov Arrives in Tbilisi, Holds Talks

LD3110100591 Moscow Radio Moscow World Service in English 0900 GMT 31 Oct 91

[Text] The Soviet defense minister, Yevgeniy Shaposhnikov, has arrived in Georgia's capital, Tbilisi. Earlier, Shaposhnikov visited two other republics in Transcaucasia—Armenia and Azerbaijan—for talks with their leaders. Among other things, Shaposhnikov discussed the status of Soviet Army units deployed on the territory of these republics. Shaposhnikov also briefed local leaders on the draft military reform providing for the establishment of republican defense ministries. The national guards, military training centers, and other units should be subordinate to them.

Cabinet of Ministers Studies Economic Crisis

OW3010164391 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1500 GMT 30 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The Cabinet of Ministers in the southern republic of Georgia has looked into the republic's economic performance in January through September.

The government admitted that the standard of living had fallen drastically and the economy plunged deeply into a crisis.

Georgia's GNP over that period totalled 17.4 bln rbls [billion rubles], 5.5 bln below the target. The national income was down 2.3%.

The republican president, Zviad Gamsakhurdia, blamed the economic failure on the previous government under Tengiz Sigua. "Those people bred corruption and anarchy", President Gamsakhurdia said. He warned that the republic was in a state of war and for that reason the government's control of the economy should be tightened.

President Gamsakhurdia was supported by Prime Minister Vissarion Gugushvili. He believes that the transition to a market economy will take years. For that government structures will have to be fostered.

20 Wounded in South Ossetian Violence

LD3010212591 Moscow TASS in English 1240 GMT 30 Oct 91

[By TASS correspondent Valeriy Shenayev]

[Text] Vladikavkaz October 30 TASS—Georgian militants have fired heavy machine-guns, mortars, anti-aircraft guns and "Alazani" anti-hail systems at the suburbs of Tskhinvali and the Prisi village last night, causing heavy damage to several dwellings, auxiliary structures and public utilities. Twenty people were wounded. Ossetian armed units were compelled to retaliate, the South Ossetian information committee's press centre reports.

Attacks of Georgian militants on control posts of the USSR Interior Ministry troops and on the helicopter regiment's barracks in the suburbs of Tskhinvali have become increasingly frequent. Their purpose is to capture weapons, communication and transport facilities.

Two servicemen were gravely wounded during last night's clashes and two noncoms were taken hostages.

A bus full of passengers was stopped in the village of Eredvi. Twelve Ossetians were taken hostages. [as received] Armed Georgian detachments continue to gather on the approaches to Tskhinvali and near the Znauri settlement, arriving there via the Gori Highway. They have cut all the by-ways used to deliver humanitarian aid to the regional centre from Vladikavkaz. The town is badly short of food, medicines and fuel. Flour is running out at the local bakery.

Opposition Claims 70 Political Prisoners Jailed

OW3110011991 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1715 GMT 30 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] It was claimed at a Wednesday meeting in Tbilisi that was organized by the Georgian National Democratic Party and was devoted to the World Political Prisoner Day that today there are at least 70 political prisoners in the republican jails. The ralliers demanded their immediate release.

Kazakhstan

Territorial Nuclear Weapons To Be Eliminated

LD3010122991 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 2330 GMT 29 Oct 91

[Text] Kazakhstan will eliminate nuclear weapons on its territory within the framework of the USSR's treaty on reducing nuclear arms. This was stated by (Marat Kazhakhmedov), a consultant to the foreign policy committee of the republic's Supreme Soviet, as reported by STUDINFORM news agency.

While not laying claim to the right to possess nuclear weapons, Kazakhstan would still like to have a so-called dual key. The nuclear button could be in the center's hands, but the government of Kazakhstan would like to know how the weapons on its territory will be used. (Kazhakhmedov) stated that as soon as the USSR begins fulfilling the treaties on reducing nuclear arms, Kazakhstan will support these initiatives completely.

Ties With UK To Expand With Nazarbayev Visit

PM3110085191 Moscow Central Television Vostok Program and Orbita Networks in Russian 1630 GMT 26 Oct 91

[From the "TV Inform" newscast: Report by D. Baimbetov and G. Shalabayev]

[Text] [Announcer] On Monday Kazakh President Nursultan Nazarbayev begins his visit to Britain. This visit is expected to help expand business contacts between Western and Kazakh entrepreneurs, of which there are already concrete examples.

[Baimbetov] In just six months this small enterprise has managed to produce Kazakhstan's first diamonds. All the equipment has been put in a tiny section in one of the workshops at Alma-Ata's Heavy Machine Building Plant. It will shortly be the largest plant in Central Asia and Kazakhstan producing synthetic diamonds for diamond instruments. In the future the range of goods will considerably expand. For now it is a matter of drill cores [burovyye kolonki], diamond drills, polishing wheels, and circular saws for cutting marble and granite. Once the plant has attained its rated capacity, 3 million carats of artificial diamonds will be produced here. These splendid samples of diamonds and diamond instruments will be procured with the help of Britain's Rasferkontex [as heard], a leader in this field. Contacts are, however, being established with British firms in other fields.

[S.Zh. Abishev, Kazakh minister of foreign economic relations] Britain's business circles are now embarking on vigorous contacts with Kazakhstan and working directly with our ministries, departments, concerns, and associations. And I think that this will develop still further after our president's trip to Britain.

Kyrgyzstan

Migration Committee To Assist Citizens

LD3010213391 Moscow TASS in English 1237 GMT 30 Oct 91

[Text] Bishkek October 30 TASS—A migration committee has been organized under the "Slavic foundation" of Kyrgyzstan. It aims to offer assistance to people leaving the republic as a result of social instability.

Russia met the initiative with understanding offering support through regional leaders and private persons interested in admitting the Russian-speaking people capable of helping to resurrect Russia. About 160 thousand Germans, Jews, Meskhetian Turks, Tartars, Russians, and Ukrainians have left Kyrgyzstan, with a population of 4-million over the past two years.

The subject is discussed in "MOLODYOZHNAYA GAZETA" (the young people's newspaper).

Tajikistan

Economic Agreement Signed With Kyrgyzstan

LD3010223391 Moscow TASS in English 1440 GMT 30 Oct 91

[By Tajikta-TASS correspondent Nina Merezhnikova]

[Text] Dushanbe October 30 TASS—Commercial and economic relations between Tajikistan and Kyrgyzstan will be promoted next year on principles of mutual advantage and within the frameworks of a single economic space. A corresponding agreement was signed here today in the course of Tajik-Kyrgyz negotiations. It was decided to keep the mutual deliveries of foodstuffs and consumer goods at the level of 70 per cent of last year's volume.

The sides agreed not to impose restrictions on direct transactions among enterprises. Tajikistan and Kyrgyzstan intend to shape a common, agreed price-formation policy in the future. Mutual settlements will be effected according to fixed and contractual prices, while world prices will be applied to certain agreed commodities.

The documents was signed by the head of government of Tajikistan Izatullo Khayev and Kyrgyz Prime-Minister Nasirdin Isanov.

Federation of Trade Unions Threaten Strike

LD2910140391 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0800 GMT 29 Oct 91

[By TAJIKTA-TASS correspondent Nina Merezhnikova]

[Text] Dushanbe, 29 Oct (TAJIKTA-TASS)—The council presidium of the Federation of Trade Unions of the Republic of Tajikistan has called on labor collectives to take part in a protest action against the worsening standard of living among working people. The protest action is planned for 11-15 November.

The statement by Tajik trade union leaders to the republican Supreme Soviet and government says that "the economic crisis has led to a sharp decline in living standards." Inflation, total deficit, unrestrained price rises, the shortage of elementary food products and essential commodities, the collapse of economic links, and growing unemployment are causing tension in society and bringing it closer to the point of explosion, the document notes.

The council Presidium of the Federation of Trade Unions demands that the republican government and Supreme Soviet adopt and introduce a clear program of social support for the population.

Among the demands are "ensuring the indexation of the population's monetary income and savings in accordance with the rise in prices, setting a minimum wage level no lower than the cost of the minimum consumer basket, and retaining for the transitional period both the existing order for granting free housing and the level of rent and communal services."

If the demands are not met, the trade unions have reserved the right to hold a republican one-hour warning strike on 28 November.

Turkmenistan

Niyazov on Treaty Signing, Administrative Reform

PM2910142191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 29 Oct 91 Union Edition p 1

[Untitled report from IZVESTIYA, TASS, INTERFAX column]

[Text] Turkmen President Saparmurad Niyazov has said that the republic is "willing to sign the Union treaty today" since it "suits and is very important for Turkmenia."

The president of Turkmenistan said that he intends to reform the system of republic state management after winding up oblast and rayon soviets. In their stead territories will be managed by representatives and an administration appointed by the president.

Republic Grain Prices 'Drastically' Increased

PM2410101991 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Oct 91 p 1

[Untitled PRAVDA-TASS column report]

[Text] Turkmen President S. Niyazov has signed a resolution drastically raising grain purchase prices. Henceforth a tonne of wheat and a tonne of rice will fetch 1,000 and 1,200 rubles [R] respectively. What is more, rice that grain growers supply in excess of the state order is valued at R2,000 per tonne.

Uzbekistan

Cyprus' Vasiliou Briefs Karimov on Cyprus Issue

NC3010205191 Nicosia Cyprus Broadcasting Corporation Radio Network in Greek 1700 GMT 30 Oct 91

[Text] The Cyprus problem and prospects for developing commercial and economic relations between Cyprus and Uzbekistan were the subject of official talks today between President of the Republic Yeoryios Vasiliou and Uzbek President Islam Karimov in Tashkent.

President Vasiliou has been in Uzbekistan since yesterday in continuation of his visit to the Soviet Union. The president briefed President Karimov on the Cyprus problem with special emphasis on recent developments since UN Security Council Resolution 716 was adopted.

Referring to an observation by President Karimov that 100 different nationalities are living in Uzbekistan, President Vasiliou stressed that he sees no reason why two different communities cannot live in Cyprus within an independent and unitary state. Regarding the issue of Uzbekistan's economic development, President Vasiliou mentioned that Cyprus can provide technical help that can be suitably utilized because, as he has ascertained, the necessary prerequisites exist, such as an industrious spirit and trained personnel.

Regarding the issue of developing commercial and economic relations between the two countries the president suggested an exchange of commercial missions. He invited the president of Uzbekistan to visit Cyprus. Accepting the invitation, President Karimov said that it would be an honor for him to visit Cyprus.

Karimov Cites Need for Republican Unity

OW3010162491 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1500 GMT 30 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] On Wednesday Uzbekistan's President Islam Karimov received President Yeoryios Vasiliou of Cyprus.

During their conversation I. Karimov pointed out that though Uzbekistan proclaimed independence, it has no intention of isolating itself from other Soviet republics. It's possible to overcome the present crisis only by joint efforts, he said.

The same day President Vasiliou visited the city of Chirchik in Tashkent region where his father, Vassos Yeoryios Vasiliou, a prominent political emigrant from Greece lived for 12 years, working at the local clinic as an eye specialist. Besides, the president of Cyprus visited Samarkand.

This evening Y. Vasiliou is leaving for Krasnodar.

Karimov Urges Account of USSR Foreign Debt

LD2910153691 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1000 GMT 29 Oct 91

[Text] President of Uzbekistan Islam Karimov says that he tried to find out, without success—including from Mikhail Gorbachev—what the money making up the former USSR's foreign debt had been spent on over the last 10 years. He reported this in Tashkent at a news conference devoted to the signing of an agreement between the Ukraine and Uzbekistan. Karimov said that until there was an exact account it will be difficult for us to determine a formula by which we can settle the problem. Karimov also recalls that other countries now owe the Soviet Union 70 billion in foreign currency rubles. Let the debt be repaid in kind, with meat, sugar, and other food products that we need so badly at present, said the president of Uzbekistan.